TRANSCRIPT OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PUBLIC OUTREACH

MAY 7, 2014 1:00 P.M. ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

THIS PROCEEDING WAS REPORTED BY:

ANNE D. WIESE, RPR, CCR
TRATTEL COURT REPORTING AND VIDEOGRAPHY
609 12TH STREET NW
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87102

Page 2 Page 4 1 **PROCEEDINGS** 1 We'll be going to North Dakota later in the week, and 2 MR. JUEN: I want to welcome all of you and 2 then we'll have a meeting next week in D.C. that will be 3 thank you very much for coming to this session with us 3 LiveStreamed, so you can continue to that if you'd like 4 today. For those of you I have not had the opportunity 4 as well. 5 to meet or work with, my name is Jesse Juen. I'm the 5 So what we hope to do today was Tim has a 6 State Director for the Bureau of Land Management in the 6 slide presentation that's going to take about 15 minutes 7 four-state area, including New Mexico, Texas, Kansas and 7 or so. And what we tried to do there was not to set out 8 Oklahoma. 8 what we think is the exclusive list of issues or 9 9 I'd like to start out to introduce our solutions or problems, but, you know, our initial take. 10 10 Deputy Director for our policy programs in D.C. Linda We've been talking to EPA, we've been talking to the 11 Lance has come with us and been with us just about six 11 states. Some of your states have already done work on 12 months; October is when she came on board. She's a lady 12 this issue. 13 with a tremendous amount of experience and a great 13 Our policy on this issue is more than 30 14 attitude, and very, very smart about picking up on 14 years old. And we had a GAO report look at it in 2010, 15 issues. She's been senior counsel. You guys may have 15 and they identified up to five percent of produced gas 16 known her when she was working with Senator Bingaman as 16 that's vented and flared, that's wasted, essentially. 17 17 So our job is to make sure that we minimize that waste, 18 MS. LANCE: From the great state of New 18 that we bring in an appropriate amount of revenue from 19 19 the resources that you all own, which we manage from Mexico. 20 20 natural gas that's produced. MR. JUEN: Yes, this is her favorite state. 21 MS. LANCE: It is. 21 And the ancillary benefit is that if we can 22 MR. JUEN: But because of her set of do a good job of that in an efficient and effective way, 22 23 23 experiences, both in the government world but also in it will reduce methane, which, as you know, is a 24 the nonprofit world and in other NGO's, etcetera, she 24 significant greenhouse gas. And I think the climate 25 comes with a wealth of experience. 25 assessment that was just released yesterday provides Page 3 Page 5 1 And with that, I'm going to let her kind of 1 even more reason for concern, and that we pay attention 2 set the stage for you today before Tim Spisak, our 2 to that. 3 Senior Advisor for the Oil and Gas Program, kind of gets 3 So that's where we are. It's worked pretty 4 into the details. Thank you. 4 well in the past for -- as Tim goes through, he'll stop 5 MS. LANCE: Hey, thank you all for coming, 5 and ask, at different sections, whether you have 6 so much. This is great to have so many of you here, and 6 questions or comments at that point. And I think that 7 I know in the middle of a workday, and I appreciate you 7 works well so that everything is clarified as we go 8 taking the time. 8 along. And then we'll have time afterwards for any 9 I'm not going to make a speech, so, you 9 comments, questions, conversation, anything like that. 10 know, I'll relieve you of that concern right off the 10 So I hope that works well for you. I thank 11 bat. All I wanted to do was just to kind of set the 11 you all so much for taking the time to work with us on 12 stage for you about where we are, BLM, in working on 12 this. We think it's important, and we want to get on it 13 this issue, and what we hope to do today at this 13 quickly, and your participation will really help us do 14 14 that. So thanks, and here's Tim. meeting. 15 We are starting work on the venting and 15 MR. SPISAK: Thanks, Linda. 16 flaring issue. We've done only -- done enough to know 16 Thanks, Jesse. 17 what we think the issues are -- a bunch of the issues 17 Again, my name is Tim Spisak, Senior 18 are, but we haven't drafted anything. We think this Advisor for Conventional Energy, located in the 18 19 will ultimately lead to a rulemaking, but we're in the 19 Washington office. 20 early stage, and we wanted to start doing some outreach 20 Just so you know, I spent 20 years over in 21 21 Amarillo working the helium program with Jesse, working meetings at that stage and hear from you before 22 22 we really put pen to paper, and make sure that we've with some of the issues in New Mexico, so I'm not 23 adequately identified the issues, that we know what some 23 totally a creature of the Washington office. But I did 24 of the solutions are and what some of the concerns are. 24 want to say that this process that we're using is 25 25 And so this is our second outreach meeting. similar to what we did with -- back in April of 2013 on

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 6

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

our Onshore Orders 3, 4 and 5 that were -- where we did some outreach of the LiveStreaming and the comment period. And we thought that worked well and wanted to kick off the venting and flaring outreach in the same

As Linda had mentioned, this is this second of four sessions that we're doing. We're bundling it with tribal discussions in the morning of each. We've got Dickinson on Friday, and then a LiveStreaming event next Thursday the 15th in D.C.

She did mention it would take about 15 minutes. That's just the slide part. So we expect there to be a number of questions and comments at each breaking point. And that's fine; that's by design. I think it worked well in Denver, and we thought we'd just continue it that way.

NTL-4A, Notice to Lessees 4A, governs venting and flaring onshore, and it dates back 30 some-odd years. There's been a lot of technological changes and different practices that changed over that period of time, and based on some of our recent Office of Inspector General and General Accountability Office reviews, they were recommending that we push forward and try to freshen, update the NTL-4A, and that's kind of what we're considering right now.

Page 8

Page 9

objective that we're trying to go through here, is through this outreach, to draw in -- put out some ideas but to start that conversation as we move through our regulatory process. This is designed to start that dialogue with the interested parties.

I've talked already about the sessions planned, and certainly, as we go through this process, we want to recognize or consider existing federal rules, those tribal rules, state rules, and any industry best practices that have developed and that might be transportable to other areas.

This pie chart here is a little dated now, but it's a source -- a breakout of emission sources. They dated that back to 2011. I must note it's onshore for -- and it's not limited to just federal leases. Starting from 12:00, moving clockwise and --

UNIDENTIFIED: Excuse me -- what units is this in? What are BCF's?

MR. SPISAK: Billing cubic feet. BCF, billing cubic feet -- sorry.

But according to that inventory, about 25 percent of emissions from oil and gas operations onshore is associated with completions and workovers, another 25 percent is associated with pneumatic devices, and the next two biggest areas were emissions from tanks and

Page 7

We're not doing this in a vacuum. We certainly recognize that EPA, with their New Source Performance Standards -- the NSPS has been in place several years now, and they generally govern air emission-type stuff for new installations, which is a little bit different than what our authorities are. Of course, our authorities surround generally around minimizing waste and royalty calculation, that sort of thing, on federal lands. But it is -- it's not our intent to overlap and duplicate, and we'll be talking a little bit about that as we go.

Also I'd like to mention, since our March session, EPA has come out with I think it's five white papers that covers liquid unloading, mag devices, hydraulic fracturing of oil well completions, natural gas compressions and leaks. These white papers range from 30 to 70 some-odd pages, and basically, they kind of set out the current state of knowledge, recapping some of the reports, both more distant and even some released this year, and put out some of the general thoughts that they have and conclusions, but then may ask a number of questions about do they have it right; is there other things that they're missing?

And it's kind of their way of doing what we're doing here -- at least that's kind of the same storage vessels and gas compressors.

Just there have been some updates, and this is an example of some of the information that we're using to help refine where we will spend our regulatory efforts. Just as a general statement, we have a certain amount of time to be able to do certain things, and certainly we want to focus where we can do the most good for the largest amount of emissions. And it's this type of data that will help inform our discussions and our efforts going forward. Certainly the feedback that we get from you all will certainly inform it also.

The eight major topics that we're going to be covering, we'll start with well completions, production tests, well purging associated with liquid unloading, casinghead and associated gas, gas conservation plans, emissions from storage vessels and tanks, pneumatic devices, and leak detection and repair.

Again, we're looking to solicit views and ideas on how to address these major topics. This is not intended to be a complete list. Through these discussions, we might identify other areas that we should consider. We may find that some of these are not realistic to consider, and that's part of the feedback that we're wanting to get from you all.

We do have a comment period, and the e-mail

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

	Page 10		Page 12
1	at the end, I'll show you, but we're looking to have	1	and drilling decisions, that there's not actually a lot
2	comments back by May 30th. And as we launch into the	2	of familiarity by BLM State and Field Office staff with
3	different ideas, basically, the format that I'll use for	3	existing waste policy. And given the fact that this
4	each major area, I'll talk about, you know, how we're	4	rulemaking may take some time, maybe a year, two years,
5	defining it, what our current BLM policy is, if any, and	5	three years, who knows, I think it would be very
6	then some of the potential ideas that we might could use	6	beneficial for BLM to issue some sort of statement to
7	to deal with it and regulate it. And at that point,	7	the effect that, "Hey, we still we have an existing
8	I'll break and I'll ask for any comments or questions or	8	waste policy. It may be imperfect, but we nonetheless
9	clarifications on it.	9	have this waste policy," and that it needs to be
10	So let's start in. First, well	10	implemented and enforced.
11	completions. Of course, this is the process to	11	And our sense is that will help with the
12	establish production from a well. I think something we	12	learning curve for state and field offices such that
13	want to point out here, we would be determining those	13	when this new rule does inevitably come out, that it
14	activities before a permanent wellhead is installed to	14	will be more easily implemented and enforced because
15	be under the realm of the well completion. Anything	15	state and field offices will be aware of the obligation
16	post-permanent wellhead we're putting into the	16	to prevent waste and will have already been thinking
17	production test bucket or some other bucket.	17	about it in the context of their place-based decision.
18	Our current policy is that there's no	18	This leads to my second point, which is
19	royalty obligation that's accrued on any produced gas	19	very much appreciate the various major topics. Our
20	that is vented or flared during the well completion	20	sense is that, with each one of these topics and each
21	phase. That's our current policy.	21	particular source of methane waste, that it's very
22	Some potential ideas would be to place no	22	important to nest this process within BLM's existing
23	due requirements on well completions. That's	23	planning and decisionmaking process.
24	recognizing that the EPA has the NSPS requirements out	24	Right now, when we've taken a look at
25	there they put out in their Quad O regulations. That	25	R/P's, leasing decisions, lease analyses, there's
	Page 11		Page 13
1	was for hydraulically fractured gas wells in developed	1	actually no recognition whatsoever that the agency has
2	fields. And we could just move forward and just let the	2	an obligation to prevent waste. At best, there is a
3	EPA regulation go forward there and cover well	3	reference to "We have a waste policy," but there's no
4	completions, or we could expand that into other areas	4	analysis about the magnitude of waste emissions.
5	other than hydraulically fractured gas wells for	5	There's analysis about greenhouse gas emissions, but not
6	capturing, or an injection user, combusting and flaring.	6	in the context of waste and not in the context of
7	So those are some other thoughts of areas that we might	7	considering alternatives specifically designed to
8	consider.	8	prevent waste. And so incorporating this rule into the
9	At this point, I'll break for any questions	9	ultimate planning, decisionmaking process we think is an
10	or comments, concerns.	10	imperative.
11	Before we start, we do have a court	11	The third comment I'd make is it's not
12	reporter here. It's our intention to put the transcript	12	clear us to why only unavoidable only avoidable waste
13	up on the web page, so we'd like you to come up to one	13	is royalty-bearing. It seems to us that even in a
14	of the microphones, state your name, and then go with	14	situation where you need to flare, for example, where
15	the question.	15	there is authorized flaring or venting, that's a cost of
16	Question? If somebody else has one, if you	16	doing business.
17	want to make your way to one of the microphones, it may	17	And with these oil and gas resources, oil
18	be a little more efficient that way.	18	and gas resources are public resources; they're owned by
19	MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Thank you, Tim.	19	the American people. And so by in effect not charging
20	My name is Erik Schlenker-Goodrich. I'm with the	20	royalties, the American people are essentially
21	Western Environmental Law Center.	21	subsidizing the waste of a resource.
22 23	I'd like to make three comments. The first	22	So we would ask BLM to consider and at
7.3	two are sort of general framing issues. You reference	23	least substantiate sort of the distinction between
	Notice to Lessee 11 It's our general sense as we've	2/	avoidable and unavoidable wests and revelty begins
24 25	Notice to Lessee 4A. It's our general sense, as we've been looking at a variety of resource management plans	24 25	avoidable and unavoidable waste and royalty-bearing versus nonroyalty-bearing, and we would encourage BLM to

Page 14 Page 16 1 1 and if you want the revenue later, the process has to kind of internalize the cost of that waste, even when 2 2 get the well cleaned up completely. So it's not this it's authorized by charging royalties on new additions. 3 So, for example, with well completions, 3 willy-nilly (Henny) Penny, it's only done when it's 4 even when it's authorized, we think that that flaring, 4 absolutely necessary. 5 if there is flaring that necessarily needs to happen, 5 Thank you. 6 whether for a public health issue or a safety issue, 6 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. Anybody else? 7 that that should be royalty-bearing regardless. 7 Okay. We'll move on to the next area, 8 Thank you. 8 production tests. Generally they're tests on oil or gas 9 9 MR. SMITH: Is there a queue or is it just wells to determine its flow capacity or for specific 10 10 first come, first serve? concerns for reservoir and flowing temperatures --11 MR. SPISAK: You're up. 11 excuse me -- pressures. Initial production tests are --12 12 MR. SMITH: Hi, Darren Smith with Devon currently, venting and flaring is authorized up to 30 13 13 days or 50 million cubic feet. Right now, we do not 14 You mentioned, Tom, that pie chart that you 14 allow the tests to exceed 24 hours. I'm sure there's 15 used throughout the admissions was updated, and I guess 15 exceptions associated with these. These would not incur 16 a suggestion we would have is industry would be -- we'd 16 any royalty, as with the completion tests. 17 like to see a similar pie chart that's kind of developed 17 Some potential options that we might use to 18 once the EPA rules fully take effect, and then also, how 18 deal with production tests: Extend some of the well 19 that -- how it also gets adjusted given the most recent 19 completion ideas to the production tests, for instance, 20 greenhouse gas inventory data that's available. 20 maybe providing some limits -- different limits for 21 It seems unfortunate that we started this 21 tighter constraints to gas wells, possibly use of some of the best available control technology that's out 22 rulemaking or this effort kind of using antiquated data, 22 23 23 and this whole effort would be better informed if we there, potentially lowering some of the limits for oil 24 really knew the extent of the emissions from the 24 well production tests. 25 industry. 25 It could require the operator to be on site Page 15 Page 17 1 Thank you. 1 for all tests, limit the performance test just to those 2 MR. SPISAK: Sure. 2 that validate performance. That sounds fairly 3 3 Just a comment about that chart. It was commonsense. One might expect that's already probably 4 something that was readily available that kind of 4 happening. 5 illustrated -- while not being the be all, end all, as I 5 Any comments or questions on production 6 mentioned earlier, there is a continuing commission 6 tests? 7 that's coming forward, and we're not limiting it to that 7 Okay. Moving right along, liquids 8 one pie chart, certainly. 8 unloading. And typically what we're talking about is 9 Any other questions, comments? 9 the well purging, the emissions associated with the 10 10 liquid unloading operation. And it's opening the well Yes, sir? 11 bore to the atmosphere, allowing the reservoir pressure 11 MR. GIRAND: Dan Girand, Mack Energy, 12 12 to push out, push off those liquids. Current BLM policy Artesia. 13 13 would limit those events to 24 hours, but we have no Let's don't forget that we are regulated by 14 14 cumulative duration times, for instance, monthly or the state. We are regulated by BLM. We have to have 15 15 permission really to vent or flare in any instance. And anything like that. 16 16 Some potential ideas could be around the now we have EPA in the mix, and I think we should be 17 careful about getting too many people regulating single 17 lines of having the operator first attempt to unload 18 events because then it gets regulations piled on each 18 liquids without venting, use potential ideas before 19 other, and they don't often match, and so you get in 19 going and using the venting as a last resort; requiring 20 this switch of what we do and what don't we do. 20 that the operator be on site during these treatment 21 The other thing to remember is that yes, 21 operations; record the cause, date, time and duration of 22 22 there is some loss of revenue out there, but we lose the the event; and then, as I've just mentioned, opening a 23 23 well bore to the atmosphere is the last resort. These most. Royalties are twelve or ten or some percent. We 24 24 first four are similar to what Colorado and Wyoming have have 90 percent of these. We are not losing anything 25 25 been talking about or have adopted recently. that we can avoid. Some of this is part of the process,

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

	Page 18		Page 20
1	Another potential idea is, for new wells	1	But your questions, comments?
2	going forward, especially in an area where historically,	2	Okay. Thank you.
3	through time, it will get to the point where you would	3	Casinghead and associated gases, it's
4	need to blow the well to the atmosphere, build in the	4	defined as the natural gas that is produced from an oil
5	infrastructure or the equipment up front or whatever it	5	well that is either sold, reinjected or used for
6	might be.	6	production purposes. Sometimes it's vented, hopefully
7	It may not be all the equipment, but the	7	rarely, or flared, depending on whether the well is
8	certain parts that are very costly to put in later, put	8	connected to a gathering line.
9	that in at the beginning, so then when you get to the	9	Current BLM policy requires operators to
10	point where you would need to install that equipment,	10	receive approval for flaring casinghead gas. And the
11	the part would already be put in. And so you would know	11	BLM considers that total leasehold production both for
12	up front that you wouldn't be allowed to blow to the	12	oil and the gas, as well for the economics of the
13	atmosphere, so you'd put in the equipment necessary to	13	field-wide plan.
14	be able to deal with it when the time comes, or possibly	14	Something to note: We have very little
15	an establishment a lower cumulative duration of	15	guidance on what constitutes an appropriate economic
16	limits for the purging operations.	16	analysis, so we the field basically relies on maybe a
17	Questions, comments, clarification?	17	state analysis or maybe the information that a company
18	Yes, sir?	18	brings. And a thought is that without some at least
19	MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Again, Erik	19	some general ideas what we're looking for, it we do
20	Schlenker-Goodrich for Western Environmental Law Center.	20	get an uneven application of the tenets of this of
21	Tim, I just wanted to echo our support for	21	the NTL-4A that applied office to office.
22	your comment about doing the upfront planning and	22	So with that being said, some of the
23	decisionmaking to ensure that the infrastructure is put	23	potential ideas would to be establish clearer economic
24	in place to capture that gas.	24	tests that would, while not necessarily spelling out a
25	One thing that we would encourage, too, is	25	specific equation, but it could be a couple templates or
	Page 19		Page 21
			1 450 21
1	thinking about not just the production side but the	1	
1 2	thinking about not just the production side but the downstream side when you get to the midstream	1 2	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a
		l .	ideas that might specify specific rates of return,
2	downstream side when you get to the midstream	2	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a
2 3	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of	2 3	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a
2 3 4	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage	2 3 4	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially
2 3 4 5	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure	2 3 4 5	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency
2 3 4 5 6	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't	2 3 4 5 6	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it
2 3 4 5 6 7	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market.	2 3 4 5 6 7	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if they are for a fixed period of time, ensuring that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's downstream processing capacity to ensure that that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's downstream processing capacity to ensure that that captured gas can actually get to market. So we would encourage you to think well, we appreciate the upfront planning and thinking about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if they are for a fixed period of time, ensuring that there's a revised economic analysis that's provided to reflect any changes in conditions that might have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's downstream processing capacity to ensure that that captured gas can actually get to market. So we would encourage you to think well,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if they are for a fixed period of time, ensuring that there's a revised economic analysis that's provided to reflect any changes in conditions that might have occurred since the last analysis was looked; and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's downstream processing capacity to ensure that that captured gas can actually get to market. So we would encourage you to think well, we appreciate the upfront planning and thinking about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve — flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if they are for a fixed period of time, ensuring that there's a revised economic analysis that's provided to reflect any changes in conditions that might have occurred since the last analysis was looked; and potentially ensuring that, as new wells are added, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's downstream processing capacity to ensure that that captured gas can actually get to market. So we would encourage you to think — well, we appreciate the upfront planning and thinking about this and put that infrastructure in place, and to think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if they are for a fixed period of time, ensuring that there's a revised economic analysis that's provided to reflect any changes in conditions that might have occurred since the last analysis was looked; and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's downstream processing capacity to ensure that that captured gas can actually get to market. So we would encourage you to think well, we appreciate the upfront planning and thinking about this and put that infrastructure in place, and to think about what the consequences are in terms of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve — flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if they are for a fixed period of time, ensuring that there's a revised economic analysis that's provided to reflect any changes in conditions that might have occurred since the last analysis was looked; and potentially ensuring that, as new wells are added, that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's downstream processing capacity to ensure that that captured gas can actually get to market. So we would encourage you to think — well, we appreciate the upfront planning and thinking about this and put that infrastructure in place, and to think about what the consequences are in terms of the downstream or upstream processing, when you get to that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if they are for a fixed period of time, ensuring that there's a revised economic analysis that's provided to reflect any changes in conditions that might have occurred since the last analysis was looked; and potentially ensuring that, as new wells are added, that the economics are reevaluated and it's just not a decision carried over from before. Questions, comments, concerns?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's downstream processing capacity to ensure that that captured gas can actually get to market. So we would encourage you to think — well, we appreciate the upfront planning and thinking about this and put that infrastructure in place, and to think about what the consequences are in terms of the downstream or upstream processing, when you get to that processing capacity, to ensure that it can get to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if they are for a fixed period of time, ensuring that there's a revised economic analysis that's provided to reflect any changes in conditions that might have occurred since the last analysis was looked; and potentially ensuring that, as new wells are added, that the economics are reevaluated and it's just not a decision carried over from before.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's downstream processing capacity to ensure that that captured gas can actually get to market. So we would encourage you to think — well, we appreciate the upfront planning and thinking about this and put that infrastructure in place, and to think about what the consequences are in terms of the downstream or upstream processing, when you get to that processing capacity, to ensure that it can get to market.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if they are for a fixed period of time, ensuring that there's a revised economic analysis that's provided to reflect any changes in conditions that might have occurred since the last analysis was looked; and potentially ensuring that, as new wells are added, that the economics are reevaluated and it's just not a decision carried over from before. Questions, comments, concerns?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	downstream side when you get to the midstream processors. In many instances, we've been aware of situations where you might have the production stage infrastructure to capture the methane, but you don't have the downstream infrastructure to actually ensure that that captured gas can get into market. And I think that's a unique area where BLM, with, for example, its planning and management authority, can ensure not just that the production stage infrastructure is put in place, but also the gathering lines, the compressor infrastructure, and that there's downstream processing capacity to ensure that that captured gas can actually get to market. So we would encourage you to think well, we appreciate the upfront planning and thinking about this and put that infrastructure in place, and to think about what the consequences are in terms of the downstream or upstream processing, when you get to that processing capacity, to ensure that it can get to market. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ideas that might specify specific rates of return, discount rates, payoff criterias; the use of a field-wide economic test, not necessarily a well-by-well; shifting gears a little bit, potentially considering some kind of gas combustion efficiency standard, making sure that the gas is flared, that it has combusted to a certain level. Some other potential options if the gas conservation is not economic: Ensure that the operator may only approve flare with an approved application to flare. Consider should these flaring approvals just be fixed for a specific period of time or maybe limitations to the number of approvals or renewals; if they are for a fixed period of time, ensuring that there's a revised economic analysis that's provided to reflect any changes in conditions that might have occurred since the last analysis was looked; and potentially ensuring that, as new wells are added, that the economics are reevaluated and it's just not a decision carried over from before. Questions, comments, concerns? MS. FOSTER: Good afternoon. My name is

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

Page 22 Page 24 1 1 turned off? process -- where after that period of time, it would be 2 2 expected that that infrastructure would be in place. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Can you hear me now? 3 There you go. My name is Karin Foster. I'm the 3 So it would be a condition of the approval 4 4 method if it wanted to be done in that time. In fact, executive director and attorney for the Independent 5 5 you wouldn't be able to start doing the well. I mean, Petroleum Association of New Mexico. 6 6 As it pertains to this question, Tim, that's what that idea is saying. 7 7 Any questions, comments, clarifications on representing independent operators, I have a concern 8 8 with our smaller operators being able to do your those? 9 9 field-wide economics. This kind of ties into the same Yes, ma'am? 10 10 issue that we're having with the Office of Natural MS. FORT: Hi, I'm Denise Fort with the New 11 Resource and Recovery in that they expect us to have 11 Mexico Rio Grande Chapter of the Sierra Club. 12 12 information from third party pipelines as well as other I'm concerned about a regulatory approach 13 companies who might be in the field. 13 that in effect provides for variances based on the 14 So in this instance, it will be very 14 economic conditions, just as was pointed out by the last 15 difficult for small operators to do field-wide economics 15 comment. And I would think that one would want to 16 16 for you. Obviously, we do informal economic analysis have -- if it's not economic to capture the gas, then 17 17 for business determinations on our own wells in perhaps it's not an appropriate time for that field to 18 18 be developed. locations, but doing a larger economic analysis will be 19 19 So in general, if environmental regulations very difficult. 20 20 are in effect, the variances are rare, this would seem Thank you. 21 MR. SPISAK: Questions, comments? 21 to put quite a burden on the field office and a burden on the NGO and the stakeholder community to participate 22 Moving right along, gas conservation plans, 22 23 23 they're defined as an action plan that eliminates or in the series of variances. 24 minimizes venting and flaring of gas from oil wells. 24 Thank you. 25 Currently, BLM policy is that -- a BLM action plan will 25 MR. SPISAK: Okay. Page 23 Page 25 1 eliminate venting or flaring from a gas well within one 1 MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Erik 2 year from the date of application. And the benefit of 2 Schlenker-Goodrich, Western Environmental Law Center. 3 3 signing one of these is that it will be royalty-free Quick question, Tim: Were you considering 4 during that implementing period. 4 the gas conservation plan in the context of specific 5 Some potential options: With an operator's 5 wells or at a different level? 6 commitment to install some of that gathering 6 MR. SPISAK: Generally, specific wells, but 7 infrastructure, then we would allow flaring during 7 if -- that's something that could be ramped up for a 8 that -- during the construction period, however long 8 field-wide-type approach. 9 that might take, possibly restricting the number of 9 MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Yeah, we would 10 extensions allowed for approval of the flaring so it's 10 strongly encourage -- and again, this goes to my prior 11 11 clear that at some point, the royalty-free use of that point about using existing planning and management 12 would go away. If gas conservation is economic and 12 authority. For example, at the R/P stage, thinking 13 there's not infrastructure in place, only allow flaring 13 about putting the gas conservation plan at that broader 14 under an approved gas conservation plan which would 14 fuel level, even at a broader resource area level, and 15 basically lay out plans for fixing it. 15 then also utilizing existing tools such as a master 16 In cases where it's clearly economic, 16 leasing plan and putting in a gas conservation plan, 17 redefine the unavoidably lost definition after a period 17 adding in several parts of that master leasing plan. 18 of time where, if it's not being collected by that time, 18 And our sense is that you would get 19 that it actually become royalty-bearing. 19 efficiencies of scale. When you'd move away from a 20 Another potential option is, going into 20 single well, you're thinking more about field-level 21 fields where you know you're going to have oil wells 21 development. So rather than a single well with a 22 22 gathering line, compressor power, you're really thinking with casinghead gas, that we would conditionally approve 23 the APD's that would allow a certain period of time, a 23 about how you're going to develop a particular field. 24 grace period, if you will -- how much time that might be 24 And this would open up the door to options 25 25 such as phase development, where you're controlling the would be up to discussion or up to the rulemaking

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

	Page 26		Page 2
1	timing, phase and location of development to maximize	1	significant delay, at least here in New Mexico, with
2	the reduction of methane waste.	2	granting those rights-of-way to lay pipe, which is
3	And this goes in echoing a point that	3	causing a lot of problems for our producers.
4	Denise made Denise Fort with Sierra Club made. In	4	So I hope that, you know, that bottleneck
5	some instances, I think if you focus in at a specific	5	will be resolved in terms of if we're going to be
6	well level, the economic may degrade such that you are	6	talking about limiting the number of extensions allowed,
7	wasting a lot of gas, and it may put into question	7	if it's based on a third party that can't get that
8	whether you can drill that particular well at all.	8	extension, or because the federal government doesn't
9	At a higher level, you might be able to	9	have enough personnel to give it the right weight.
10	facilitate better development, more economic	10	There's issues there.
11	development, and ultimately optimize the extraction of	11	MR. SPISAK: And that's understood.
12	the oil and gas resource while minimizing the	12	MS. FOSTER: Thank you.
13	infrastructure on the landscape. And that would also	13	MR. SPISAK: Thanks.
14	have an indirect effect, beneficial effects to, for	14	Any others? Okay.
15	example, wildlife.	15	Emissions from storage tanks and vessels
16	So if you're controlling phasing	16	kind of defines itself. There are gas vapors lost from
17	development, you're not only helping to reduce methane	17	the storage tank on a lease. Current BLM policy is that
18	waste, you might also be help to protect other	18	those vapors released from storage tanks are seen as
19	resources on the landscape, again, like wildlife, water,	19	unavoidably lost, and they do not generate any royalty
20	public health, whatever.	20	bearing unless the authorized officer requires recovery.
21	Thank you.	21	Some potential options. Understanding that
22	MR. SPISAK: I think it's fair to say that	22	new wells are covered by the new BLM or excuse me -
23	over the years, the last ten years or so or more, that	23	EPA New Source Rules, they require the combustion or
24	BLM has done more planning, and certainly the plans have	24	capture of gas vapors from these storage vessels with
25	gotten more restrictive, not less. We, as a matter of	25	the emission greater potentially greater than six
	Page 27		Page 2
1	course, will often use full field developmental EIS's as	1	tons per year of volatile organic compounds, VOC's. So
2	a means of analyzing, not on a well-by-well basis	2	we wouldn't duplicate that, but it's more of a
3	we've kind of gotten away, to a large extent not	3	recognition of what's out there already.
4	completely, but to a large extent, the well-by-well type		
4	completely, but to a large extent, the well-by-well type	4	Where potentially we might go would be for
5	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts	4 5	Where potentially we might go would be for existing wells, would we require installation of
	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts		
5		5	existing wells, would we require installation of
5 6	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind	5 6	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions
5 6 7	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction.	5 6 7	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same
5 6 7 8	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments?	5 6 7 8	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines.
5 6 7 8 9	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please?	5 6 7 8 9	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater — maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of
5 6 7 8 9 10	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the	5 6 7 8 9 10	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater — maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too tightly capped or whatever. With those types of things,
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it states that flaring is authorized during construction	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater — maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it states that flaring is authorized during construction time. That's kind of a vague term. Construction time	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater — maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too tightly capped or whatever. With those types of things,
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it states that flaring is authorized during construction time. That's kind of a vague term. Construction time of the pipeline, construction time of the well? What	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater — maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too tightly capped or whatever. With those types of things, we would like to hear more.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it states that flaring is authorized during construction time. That's kind of a vague term. Construction time of the pipeline, construction time of the well? What are you talking about, construction time? MR. SPISAK: Good question, I mean, define it. I mean, at this point, it's just — it's a thought,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater — maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too tightly capped or whatever. With those types of things, we would like to hear more. Any questions or comments about storage
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it states that flaring is authorized during construction time. That's kind of a vague term. Construction time of the pipeline, construction time of the well? What are you talking about, construction time? MR. SPISAK: Good question, I mean, define	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too tightly capped or whatever. With those types of things, we would like to hear more. Any questions or comments about storage vessels and tank emissions? Yes, ma'am? MS. FOSTER: Sorry, guys. Again, Karin
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it states that flaring is authorized during construction time. That's kind of a vague term. Construction time of the pipeline, construction time of the well? What are you talking about, construction time? MR. SPISAK: Good question, I mean, define it. I mean, at this point, it's just — it's a thought,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too tightly capped or whatever. With those types of things, we would like to hear more. Any questions or comments about storage vessels and tank emissions? Yes, ma'am?
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it states that flaring is authorized during construction time. That's kind of a vague term. Construction time of the pipeline, construction time of the well? What are you talking about, construction time? MR. SPISAK: Good question, I mean, define it. I mean, at this point, it's just it's a thought, it's an idea, what might construction time be. Is it	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too tightly capped or whatever. With those types of things, we would like to hear more. Any questions or comments about storage vessels and tank emissions? Yes, ma'am? MS. FOSTER: Sorry, guys. Again, Karin
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it states that flaring is authorized during construction time. That's kind of a vague term. Construction time of the pipeline, construction time of the well? What are you talking about, construction time? MR. SPISAK: Good question, I mean, define it. I mean, at this point, it's just it's a thought, it's an idea, what might construction time be. Is it just the stuff on lease or is it how far does it go?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too tightly capped or whatever. With those types of things, we would like to hear more. Any questions or comments about storage vessels and tank emissions? Yes, ma'am? MS. FOSTER: Sorry, guys. Again, Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it states that flaring is authorized during construction time. That's kind of a vague term. Construction time of the pipeline, construction time of the well? What are you talking about, construction time? MR. SPISAK: Good question, I mean, define it. I mean, at this point, it's just it's a thought, it's an idea, what might construction time be. Is it just the stuff on lease or is it how far does it go? MS. FOSTER: Right. And then again, you	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater — maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too tightly capped or whatever. With those types of things, we would like to hear more. Any questions or comments about storage vessels and tank emissions? Yes, ma'am? MS. FOSTER: Sorry, guys. Again, Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. I did have a meeting with several of my members, and so a lot of questions came up. That's why
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of (inaudible) analysis and looked at the larger impacts at a fuel development level. And I could see this kind of going in that direction. So any other questions, comments? Yes, please? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Under your potential option, number one, it states that flaring is authorized during construction time. That's kind of a vague term. Construction time of the pipeline, construction time of the well? What are you talking about, construction time? MR. SPISAK: Good question, I mean, define it. I mean, at this point, it's just it's a thought, it's an idea, what might construction time be. Is it just the stuff on lease or is it how far does it go? MS. FOSTER: Right. And then again, you know, as it pertains to construction time and extension	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	existing wells, would we require installation of combusters for storage vessels with the emissions greater — maybe a higher threshold, maybe the same threshold, something along those lines. Is there another threshold or some kind of throughput that would be better served than a ton per year of VOC's? Are there safety-related thresholds? I know certainly there's a concern you don't want storage vessels, you know, blowing up because we've got them too tightly capped or whatever. With those types of things, we would like to hear more. Any questions or comments about storage vessels and tank emissions? Yes, ma'am? MS. FOSTER: Sorry, guys. Again, Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. I did have a meeting with several of my

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

	Page 30		Page 32
1	MS. FOSTER: Okay. Thank you.	1	safety concerns, and obviously, we all have some safety
2	On this storage tank issue, obviously,	2	concerns when we're out there on location. But that
3	Subpart Quad O did come into effect. And the first	3	question is kind of a catchall. And opening it up to
4	reporting requirement was on April 15th, and so	4	safety really does expand it significantly, and that's
5	operators are trying to deal with that. And as you	5	concerning.
6	know, Subpart Quad O is for new tanks that were	6	MR. SPISAK: Thanks.
7	installed after a certain date, very recent.	7	Any other question, comment?
8	So expansion of your policy to existing	8	Yes, sir?
9	wells obviously is very concerning to us because,	9	MR. GIRAND: Dan Girand, Mack Energy,
10	frankly, for small operators again, we are trying to	10	Artesia.
11	figure out we're trying to hold onto the tail of the	11	Well, I hear you saying stuff in the future
12	donkey, so to speak that's Subpart Quad O right	12	you're going to comment on. I see a great additional
13	now and figure out what we need to do just for those	13	workload on BLM and on industry. And the problem is
14	new locations. And trying to expand it to existing	14	that we're not getting permits on time, quickly now.
15	locations is going to be extremely overwhelming.	15	And to do all of these things and bog yourself down even
16	What we would ask for is that if you were	16	more, how is that going to work? It's going to be an
17	to do this, that you would at least have the same	17	improbable situation.
18	requirements as Subpart Quad O in terms of the six tons	18	MR. SPISAK: Understood. That's part of
19	per year (inaudible) as a requirement. And then under	19	the economic analysis and going through the process.
20	Subpart Quad O, there is an off-ramp opportunity there	20	Thank you for the comment.
21	that if you drop below the four tons per year, then you	21	Yes, ma'am?
22	don't have to report anymore. So we hope that you're at	22	MS. FEIBELMAN: Camille Feibelman, Rio
23	least going to be consistent.	23	Grande Chapter Director.
	As for the existing wells, obviously, you	24	And although I know that the previous
24			
25	know, I think at this point, my response would be any	25	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in
25	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31	25	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33
	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be	25	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for
25	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and	25 1 2	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions
25 1 2	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting.	25	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for
25 1 2 3	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would	25 1 2 3	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a
1 2 3 4	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last	25 1 2 3 4	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for
1 2 3 4 5	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would	25 1 2 3 4 5	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule,
1 2 3 4 5 6	Rinally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing	25 1 2 3 4 5 6	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Rage 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure.	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule?
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Rinally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Rage 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point.
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Rage 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it?	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes.	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes. MR. SPISAK: Good.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Rage 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes. MR. SPISAK: Good. Final point? MS. FOSTER: I think my operators would agree with that statement.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a considerable amount of time on, we're working through.
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	know, I think at this point, my response would be any Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes. MR. SPISAK: Good. Final point? MS. FOSTER: I think my operators would	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	speaker was speaking specifically about storage, in Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a considerable amount of time on, we're working through. We don't have any hard deadlines on it. Certainly to
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Rage 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes. MR. SPISAK: Good. Final point? MS. FOSTER: I think my operators would agree with that statement. Finally, the last thing that I would say is that throwing in the safety-related threshold question	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a considerable amount of time on, we're working through. We don't have any hard deadlines on it. Certainly to some degree, some announcement at a higher level, this kind of dovetails it. As far as working with EPA and DOE and all
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes. MR. SPISAK: Good. Final point? MS. FOSTER: I think my operators would agree with that statement. Finally, the last thing that I would say is that throwing in the safety-related threshold question at the very end there opens up a whole new other can of	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a considerable amount of time on, we're working through. We don't have any hard deadlines on it. Certainly to some degree, some announcement at a higher level, this kind of dovetails it. As far as working with EPA and DOE and all that, I mean, we're not doing this in a vacuum. It is
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Rage 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes. MR. SPISAK: Good. Final point? MS. FOSTER: I think my operators would agree with that statement. Finally, the last thing that I would say is that throwing in the safety-related threshold question	25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a considerable amount of time on, we're working through. We don't have any hard deadlines on it. Certainly to some degree, some announcement at a higher level, this kind of dovetails it. As far as working with EPA and DOE and all that, I mean, we're not doing this in a vacuum. It is working with those other agencies. And what they're
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes. MR. SPISAK: Good. Final point? MS. FOSTER: I think my operators would agree with that statement. Finally, the last thing that I would say is that throwing in the safety-related threshold question at the very end there opens up a whole new other can of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a considerable amount of time on, we're working through. We don't have any hard deadlines on it. Certainly to some degree, some announcement at a higher level, this kind of dovetails it. As far as working with EPA and DOE and all that, I mean, we're not doing this in a vacuum. It is working with those other agencies. And what they're doing I kind of mentioned earlier about trying to
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes. MR. SPISAK: Good. Final point? MS. FOSTER: I think my operators would agree with that statement. Finally, the last thing that I would say is that throwing in the safety-related threshold question at the very end there opens up a whole new other can of worms and studies and issues that really would need to be addressed appropriately in order to give you a decent threshold number. So that's kind of another big huge	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a considerable amount of time on, we're working through. We don't have any hard deadlines on it. Certainly to some degree, some announcement at a higher level, this kind of dovetails it. As far as working with EPA and DOE and all that, I mean, we're not doing this in a vacuum. It is working with those other agencies. And what they're doing I kind of mentioned earlier about trying to dovetail in with the other regulatory efforts. We
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes. MR. SPISAK: Good. Final point? MS. FOSTER: I think my operators would agree with that statement. Finally, the last thing that I would say is that throwing in the safety-related threshold question at the very end there opens up a whole new other can of worms and studies and issues that really would need to be addressed appropriately in order to give you a decent	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a considerable amount of time on, we're working through. We don't have any hard deadlines on it. Certainly to some degree, some announcement at a higher level, this kind of dovetails it. As far as working with EPA and DOE and all that, I mean, we're not doing this in a vacuum. It is working with those other agencies. And what they're doing I kind of mentioned earlier about trying to dovetail in with the other regulatory efforts. We absolutely do not want to pile on with any — as much as
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 31 number that you pick for an existing well would be problematic for us because we'd have to go out there and do all that reporting. Finally, the last thing that I would MR. SPISAK: Before you do the last thing MS. FOSTER: Sure. MR. SPISAK: I would then gather from what you're saying is even if we came up with a better way, there's more value in being consistent with EPA than going with some other way of doing it? MS. FOSTER: Yes, yes. MR. SPISAK: Good. Final point? MS. FOSTER: I think my operators would agree with that statement. Finally, the last thing that I would say is that throwing in the safety-related threshold question at the very end there opens up a whole new other can of worms and studies and issues that really would need to be addressed appropriately in order to give you a decent threshold number. So that's kind of another big huge	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 33 general, we're wondering, does the BLM have a plan for coordinating their efforts to curb methane emissions with those EPA and DOE in general, just for consistency's sake? And on that same line, is there a timeline for finalizing the hydraulic fracturing rule, and how would that influence the timeline on the methane rule? I recognize that that's beyond the scope of storage vessel and tank emissions, but it seemed like a good launch-off point. MR. SPISAK: Hydraulic fracturing is our number one priority now. We're working on that to completion. This is the next one that we're spending a considerable amount of time on, we're working through. We don't have any hard deadlines on it. Certainly to some degree, some announcement at a higher level, this kind of dovetails it. As far as working with EPA and DOE and all that, I mean, we're not doing this in a vacuum. It is working with those other agencies. And what they're doing I kind of mentioned earlier about trying to dovetail in with the other regulatory efforts. We

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

	Page 34		Page 36
1	discussion of some of these MOU's with states, and kind	1	and not royalty-bearing.
2	of trueing up what regulations they might have and what	2	Potential options again, we have a
3	regulation we might put out and try to normalize them	3	little bit of an overlap here with EPA, new devices or
4	within, you know, the administrative boundaries of the	4	replacement devices. EPA is requiring that those
5	state, and come up with one consistent set of rules and	5	devices between the wellhead and processing plant must
6	not have different ones that you all are having to deal	6	be low-bleed. New pneumatics at the processing plant
7	with. I mean, that's part of our objectives and goals	7	must be zero-bleed. I think they do have some
8	going forward as we promulgate whether it will be	8	exceptions with equipment that need you know,
9	hydraulic fracturing, the venting and flaring, or	9	fast-acting or need a higher rate, there are some
10	onshores.	10	exceptions built into the NSPS rules.
11	I'm not sure if that caught everything	11	What we might potentially consider is those
12	there, but there will be a time at the end for general	12	existing devices where, for instance, you know, you
13	questions, too. Any other questions on storage tank	13	could use an equation, for instance, where if you put in
14	vessels?	14	a new piece of equipment and it was able to reduce the
15	MR. GIRAND: Yes, if I may?	15	bleed from the existing piece of equipment to the new
16	MR. SPISAK: Sure.	16	piece of equipment, considering the cost to of that
17	MR. GIRAND: Dan Girand with Mack Energy.	17	valve or controller, and the insulation cost, a price
18	What do you visualize the combustion of gas	18	for natural gas and how long might that pay out.
19	vapors?	19	You know, if it takes 30 years to pay out,
20	MR. SPISAK: Say again.	20	obviously, you, you know, replace it. If it's twelve
21	MR. GIRAND: What do you mean by combustion	21	months, you know, maybe it should be replaced. You
22	of the gas vapors?	22	know, we could come up with a formula that does that.
23	MR. SPISAK: Well, I understand flaring and	23	Maybe, upon further analysis, we might see a break point
24	combusting is not necessarily the same thing. The	24	that if you're able to reduce a replacement of new
25	combusting is to an efficiency level of and don't	25	equipment by going from maybe like 15 cubic feet per
1	quote me exactly the numbers; I know we've got it		
		1	hour yeah, cubic feet per hour to get some kind of
2	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the	2	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be
3	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency	2 3	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that.
3 4	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense?	2 3 4	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought
3 4 5	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and	2 3 4 5	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe
3 4 5 6	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose	2 3 4 5 6	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a
3 4 5 6 7	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that.	2 3 4 5 6 7	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year.
3 4 5 6 7 8	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes. MR. SPISAK: Any other questions, comments?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just thrown out some ideas off the top of my head how we
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes. MR. SPISAK: Any other questions, comments? Moving right along. Pneumatic devices,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just thrown out some ideas off the top of my head how we might do that. But that's something we'd like to hear
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes. MR. SPISAK: Any other questions, comments? Moving right along. Pneumatic devices, these are all sorts of the equipment on a lease that use	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just thrown out some ideas off the top of my head how we might do that. But that's something we'd like to hear some thoughts and ideas about what might make sense for
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes. MR. SPISAK: Any other questions, comments? Moving right along. Pneumatic devices, these are all sorts of the equipment on a lease that use pressurized natural gas to operate. Generally, if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just thrown out some ideas off the top of my head how we might do that. But that's something we'd like to hear some thoughts and ideas about what might make sense for existing devices, recognizing that new replacement
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes. MR. SPISAK: Any other questions, comments? Moving right along. Pneumatic devices, these are all sorts of the equipment on a lease that use pressurized natural gas to operate. Generally, if there's electric power nearby, you wouldn't be using	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just thrown out some ideas off the top of my head how we might do that. But that's something we'd like to hear some thoughts and ideas about what might make sense for existing devices, recognizing that new replacement devices are already covered by EPA.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes. MR. SPISAK: Any other questions, comments? Moving right along. Pneumatic devices, these are all sorts of the equipment on a lease that use pressurized natural gas to operate. Generally, if there's electric power nearby, you wouldn't be using pneumatic devices, you'd be using electric; or if it's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just thrown out some ideas off the top of my head how we might do that. But that's something we'd like to hear some thoughts and ideas about what might make sense for existing devices, recognizing that new replacement devices are already covered by EPA. Questions, comment, clarifications?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes. MR. SPISAK: Any other questions, comments? Moving right along. Pneumatic devices, these are all sorts of the equipment on a lease that use pressurized natural gas to operate. Generally, if there's electric power nearby, you wouldn't be using pneumatic devices, you'd be using electric; or if it's a (inaudible), you might have instrument error or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just thrown out some ideas off the top of my head how we might do that. But that's something we'd like to hear some thoughts and ideas about what might make sense for existing devices, recognizing that new replacement devices are already covered by EPA. Questions, comment, clarifications? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes. MR. SPISAK: Any other questions, comments? Moving right along. Pneumatic devices, these are all sorts of the equipment on a lease that use pressurized natural gas to operate. Generally, if there's electric power nearby, you wouldn't be using pneumatic devices, you'd be using electric; or if it's a (inaudible), you might have instrument error or something like that. But generally, on lease, these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just thrown out some ideas off the top of my head how we might do that. But that's something we'd like to hear some thoughts and ideas about what might make sense for existing devices, recognizing that new replacement devices are already covered by EPA. Questions, comment, clarifications? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes. MR. SPISAK: Any other questions, comments? Moving right along. Pneumatic devices, these are all sorts of the equipment on a lease that use pressurized natural gas to operate. Generally, if there's electric power nearby, you wouldn't be using pneumatic devices, you'd be using electric; or if it's a (inaudible), you might have instrument error or something like that. But generally, on lease, these types of devices are powered by off the natural gas	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just thrown out some ideas off the top of my head how we might do that. But that's something we'd like to hear some thoughts and ideas about what might make sense for existing devices, recognizing that new replacement devices are already covered by EPA. Questions, comment, clarifications? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association. Doing the economics for every single valve
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there but of like 95 percent of the methane in the gas or better. And so it's a combustion efficiency standard. Does that make sense? MR. GIRAND: Well, the capturing and combustion of the vapors, if we combust them, you lose royalty off of that. MR. SPISAK: If you could capture the gas and sell it, of course that's the preference. If you can't capture it because it's maybe not enough to justify or there's not a pipeline infrastructure there or whatever, then we want you to at least flare it or combust it instead of just venting it. Does that help? MR. GIRAND: Yes. MR. SPISAK: Any other questions, comments? Moving right along. Pneumatic devices, these are all sorts of the equipment on a lease that use pressurized natural gas to operate. Generally, if there's electric power nearby, you wouldn't be using pneumatic devices, you'd be using electric; or if it's a (inaudible), you might have instrument error or something like that. But generally, on lease, these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reduction, it might, in a large majority of cases, be cost-effective to do that. So, you know, those types of thought processes about looking at existing equipment, maybe it's a range, those that have bleed rates above a certain amount be looked at, you know, within a year. I'm just talking off the top of my head now. Maybe if it's below a certain threshold, you have two years to look at or something like that, because we started looking at some of the calculations, and, depending on the cost of some of these things, they could pay out pretty rapidly. How might this be administered? I've just thrown out some ideas off the top of my head how we might do that. But that's something we'd like to hear some thoughts and ideas about what might make sense for existing devices, recognizing that new replacement devices are already covered by EPA. Questions, comment, clarifications? MS. FOSTER: Karin Foster on behalf of the Independent Petroleum Association.

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

	Page 38		Page 40
1	say that you need to roll in the price of natural gas,	1	quantifying how much gas is coming from those types of
2	but each operator gets different recovery for their gas;	2	things.
3	they get different amounts for their gas depending on	3	Will technology bail us out on this,
4	their location and their relationship with their	4	whether it be some kind of flow meter that will be able
5	marketers. So doing a set price of natural gas is	5	to put those two things together? I mean, that remains
6	probably going to end up either too high or too low for	6	to be seen. But until that time, what might we do in
7	a lot of operators, and doing the formula is going to be	7	the leak detection area along the lines of leak
8	problematic.	8	detection?
9	What this really comes back down to is what	9	Questions, comments, clarifications?
10	I said earlier, which is that each operator, whether	10	You should have sat at the end there.
11	independent or major, is going to do economics on every	11	MS. FOSTER: I know. This is the last
12	single well to decide if they want to keep that well up	12	issue, I think.
13	and running and what the regulatory cost of running that	13	This is actually really a question really
14	well is. And they have their own independent	14	for our edification, and that is what if you have an
15	evaluations for price of natural gas and price of the	15	emission that comes out of a pressure relief valve or a
16	cost of replacing the devices and all that.	16	(inaudible)? Is that considered a leak, because those
17	So again, going into economics is going to	17	things are really there for safety reasons, and if you
18	be very difficult. And again, Subpart Quad O does have	18	don't have them, then where do those excess emissions
19	a provision on pneumatic devices. We would again	19	come from?
20	suggest that you let Subpart Quad O play out and see how	20	MR. SPISAK: That's not considered a leak,
21	much that does reduce emissions before you pile on.	21	that's an operational deal.
22	Thank you.	22	MS. FOSTER: Okay. So that's considered
23	MR. SPISAK: Any questions, comments?	23	operational, that's not considered a leak?
24	Thank you.	24	MR. SPISAK: If you have a pressure relief
25	Okay. Last major one, leak detection and	25	valve and it operates, it does its job. That's not a
		1	
	Page 39		Page 41
1	_	1	Page 41 leak.
1 2	Page 39 repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now,	1 2	leak.
	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce		leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned
2	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now,	2	leak.
2 3	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring	2 3	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is actually now has been
2 3 4	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like	2 3 4	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th.
2 3 4 5	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some	2 3 4 5	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right.
2 3 4 5 6	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or	2 3 4 5 6	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to
2 3 4 5 6 7	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the	2 3 4 5 6 7	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds, we go about — I know Colorado has thrown out some ideas in that area. What thresholds might be useful to do that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking at what different states are doing and trying to not have to start from scratch ourselves, use lessons learned.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds, we go about — I know Colorado has thrown out some ideas in that area. What thresholds might be useful to do that? There's been a recent report that said 97 percent of all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking at what different states are doing and trying to not have to start from scratch ourselves, use lessons learned. MS. FOSTER: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds, we go about — I know Colorado has thrown out some ideas in that area. What thresholds might be useful to do that? There's been a recent report that said 97 percent of all leaks are economic to repair. I mean, that's something	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking at what different states are doing and trying to not have to start from scratch ourselves, use lessons learned. MS. FOSTER: Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds, we go about — I know Colorado has thrown out some ideas in that area. What thresholds might be useful to do that? There's been a recent report that said 97 percent of all leaks are economic to repair. I mean, that's something that came out fairly recently. You can certainly go out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking at what different states are doing and trying to not have to start from scratch ourselves, use lessons learned. MS. FOSTER: Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. SMITH: Hi. Darren Smith again with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds, we go about — I know Colorado has thrown out some ideas in that area. What thresholds might be useful to do that? There's been a recent report that said 97 percent of all leaks are economic to repair. I mean, that's something that came out fairly recently. You can certainly go out and turn a valve, tighten it up, take a wrench and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking at what different states are doing and trying to not have to start from scratch ourselves, use lessons learned. MS. FOSTER: Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. SMITH: Hi. Darren Smith again with Devon Energy. I think I called you Tom earlier.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds, we go about — I know Colorado has thrown out some ideas in that area. What thresholds might be useful to do that? There's been a recent report that said 97 percent of all leaks are economic to repair. I mean, that's something that came out fairly recently. You can certainly go out and turn a valve, tighten it up, take a wrench and tighten a packing and fix it, you know, obviously, if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking at what different states are doing and trying to not have to start from scratch ourselves, use lessons learned. MS. FOSTER: Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. SMITH: Hi. Darren Smith again with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds, we go about — I know Colorado has thrown out some ideas in that area. What thresholds might be useful to do that? There's been a recent report that said 97 percent of all leaks are economic to repair. I mean, that's something that came out fairly recently. You can certainly go out and turn a valve, tighten it up, take a wrench and tighten a packing and fix it, you know, obviously, if you do that sort of thing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking at what different states are doing and trying to not have to start from scratch ourselves, use lessons learned. MS. FOSTER: Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. SMITH: Hi. Darren Smith again with Devon Energy. I think I called you Tom earlier. MR. SPISAK: I've been called worse; don't worry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds, we go about — I know Colorado has thrown out some ideas in that area. What thresholds might be useful to do that? There's been a recent report that said 97 percent of all leaks are economic to repair. I mean, that's something that came out fairly recently. You can certainly go out and turn a valve, tighten it up, take a wrench and tighten a packing and fix it, you know, obviously, if you do that sort of thing. Where there are tools coming out there, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking at what different states are doing and trying to not have to start from scratch ourselves, use lessons learned. MS. FOSTER: Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. SMITH: Hi. Darren Smith again with Devon Energy. I think I called you Tom earlier. MR. SPISAK: I've been called worse; don't worry. MR. SMITH: I've got a comment and then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds, we go about — I know Colorado has thrown out some ideas in that area. What thresholds might be useful to do that? There's been a recent report that said 97 percent of all leaks are economic to repair. I mean, that's something that came out fairly recently. You can certainly go out and turn a valve, tighten it up, take a wrench and tighten a packing and fix it, you know, obviously, if you do that sort of thing. Where there are tools coming out there, I'm sure you all are familiar with the infrared cameras that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking at what different states are doing and trying to not have to start from scratch ourselves, use lessons learned. MS. FOSTER: Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. SMITH: Hi. Darren Smith again with Devon Energy. I think I called you Tom earlier. MR. SPISAK: I've been called worse; don't worry. MR. SMITH: I've got a comment and then maybe a question. And the question I have doesn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	repair, it's defined as programs to identify and reduce those leaks from loss from lease operations. Right now, BLM doesn't have any leak detection or monitoring standard. These might be something that might be like on a routine basis or some kind of scheduling, some other fashion, whether it be throughput of a facility or the size of a facility. I started to get into the potential options there a little bit. It could be based on a periodic inspection of facilities. If you do it annually everywhere, do you do it annually for locations above X number of cubic feet a month? I mean, you know, different thresholds, we go about — I know Colorado has thrown out some ideas in that area. What thresholds might be useful to do that? There's been a recent report that said 97 percent of all leaks are economic to repair. I mean, that's something that came out fairly recently. You can certainly go out and turn a valve, tighten it up, take a wrench and tighten a packing and fix it, you know, obviously, if you do that sort of thing. Where there are tools coming out there, I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	leak. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And then you mentioned the Colorado rule, which is — actually now has been implemented. I think it came into effect on April 14th. MR. SPISAK: Right. MS. FOSTER: And so again, we would ask to see how that's going to be implemented in terms of enforcement actions, how that regulatory agency is going to work with that rule, and then we can use what we learn from the implementation of that rule to do this one. MR. SPISAK: And that's why we're looking at what different states are doing and trying to not have to start from scratch ourselves, use lessons learned. MS. FOSTER: Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. SMITH: Hi. Darren Smith again with Devon Energy. I think I called you Tom earlier. MR. SPISAK: I've been called worse; don't worry. MR. SMITH: I've got a comment and then

	Page 42		Page 44
1	But my first comment would be and a	1	process as we go forward into an eventual proposed rule
2	suggestion for you is you know, you mentioned a	2	for formal comment by folks such as yourself.
3	couple times that it's your intent to harmonize with	3	MS. LANCE: Yeah, if I can just say, on us
4	what's going on with the EPA. But what I would	4	looking at what EPA has already done, I can assure you
5	encourage you to do is, if you haven't already, review	5	that we will do that. And if that saves the industry
6	the Quad O docket and preamble to the Quad O Rule,	6	time to know that, then let me give you that assurance.
7	because I think a lot of the things that you're talking	7	What we want to do, though, is be as open
8	about, EPA has already addressed. So I would encourage	8	as possible to ideas that evolve over time or
9	you to study that because I think it would save you a	9	technologies that emerge or problems that emerge. So we
10	lot of time trying to maybe ask industry to tell you	10	clearly wouldn't want to just move forward by saying,
11	again some of the history around some of the things that	11	"EPA already did all the work, so we don't need to
12	you may be proposing in this, so that would benefit us,	12	gather any additional information."
13	too.	13	So that's really what we're trying to do
14	The second question I have is more around	14	here, is be as open as possible to anything that you all
15	jurisdiction. And again, there's a fuzzy line between I	15	may want to add or things that, (inaudible) comments,
16	think what BLM is proposing here and what EPA we believe	16	etcetera.
17	has authority over. So I guess my question to you is,	17	MS. FOSTER: Tim, can I ask a question on
18	do you really see BLM's role in kind of establishing	18	that?
19	what is avoidable and what's unavoidable gas loss and	19	MR. SPISAK: Yes.
20	then imposing royalty, you know, requirements on that,	20	MS. FOSTER: It's me again.
21	or do you really see and do you see EPA's role in	21	To this young lady's comments concerning
22	managing air quality and kind of technology	22	EPA, April 15, EPA released five white papers on methane
23	requirements, that sort of thing? Because there's	23	reductions.
24	comments in here that perhaps you're suggesting that	24	MR. SPISAK: I mentioned those earlier.
25	maybe BLM's role would to be establish things like	25	MS. FOSTER: Okay. And I caused myself a
1	Page 43		Page 45
1	construction efficiencies for some of these technical	1	little bit of brain damage trying to read through those
2	construction efficiencies for some of these technical things that it's really our perspective that that's	1 2	little bit of brain damage trying to read through those things. And obviously, they're still in they're not
2	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here	2	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not
2 3	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating	2 3	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer
2 3 4	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here	2 3 4	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now.
2 3 4 5	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of resource also have a benefit to, you know, air quality.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't especially like some of the studies that they've relied
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of resource also have a benefit to, you know, air quality. So it's hard to divide a fine line, say,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't especially like some of the studies that they've relied upon and some of the modeling that they've done. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of resource also have a benefit to, you know, air quality. So it's hard to divide a fine line, say, "Well, if it has anything to do with air quality, then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't especially like some of the studies that they've relied upon and some of the modeling that they've done. I think that they have based some of their recent study
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of resource also have a benefit to, you know, air quality. So it's hard to divide a fine line, say, "Well, if it has anything to do with air quality, then we can't touch it." So it's part of this discussion,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't especially like some of the studies that they've relied upon and some of the modeling that they've done. I think that they have based some of their recent study conclusions on some faulty modeling. For example, they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of resource also have a benefit to, you know, air quality. So it's hard to divide a fine line, say, "Well, if it has anything to do with air quality, then we can't touch it." So it's part of this discussion, part of what we go through in talking with our legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't especially like some of the studies that they've relied upon and some of the modeling that they've done. I think that they have based some of their recent study conclusions on some faulty modeling. For example, they rely a lot on a 1996 study that does not even address
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of resource also have a benefit to, you know, air quality. So it's hard to divide a fine line, say, "Well, if it has anything to do with air quality, then we can't touch it." So it's part of this discussion, part of what we go through in talking with our legal folks and have that type of conversation internally.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	things. And obviously, they're still in — they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for — okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't especially like some of the studies that they've relied upon and some of the modeling that they've done. I think that they have based some of their recent study conclusions on some faulty modeling. For example, they rely a lot on a 1996 study that does not even address reduced production compressors, so they can't even
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of resource also have a benefit to, you know, air quality. So it's hard to divide a fine line, say, "Well, if it has anything to do with air quality, then we can't touch it." So it's part of this discussion, part of what we go through in talking with our legal folks and have that type of conversation internally. Certainly they thought some ideas that are going to come	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	things. And obviously, they're still in — they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for — okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't especially like some of the studies that they've relied upon and some of the modeling that they've done. I think that they have based some of their recent study conclusions on some faulty modeling. For example, they rely a lot on a 1996 study that does not even address reduced production compressors, so they can't even really give us any true information on reciprocating
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of resource also have a benefit to, you know, air quality. So it's hard to divide a fine line, say, "Well, if it has anything to do with air quality, then we can't touch it." So it's part of this discussion, part of what we go through in talking with our legal folks and have that type of conversation internally. Certainly they thought some ideas that are going to come from you all on both sides well, many sides; it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	things. And obviously, they're still in — they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for — okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't especially like some of the studies that they've relied upon and some of the modeling that they've done. I think that they have based some of their recent study conclusions on some faulty modeling. For example, they rely a lot on a 1996 study that does not even address reduced production compressors, so they can't even really give us any true information on reciprocating versus the other — the compressors.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of resource also have a benefit to, you know, air quality. So it's hard to divide a fine line, say, "Well, if it has anything to do with air quality, then we can't touch it." So it's part of this discussion, part of what we go through in talking with our legal folks and have that type of conversation internally. Certainly they thought some ideas that are going to come from you all on both sides well, many sides; it's probably more than just two sides that we're going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	things. And obviously, they're still in — they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for — okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't especially like some of the studies that they've relied upon and some of the modeling that they've done. I think that they have based some of their recent study conclusions on some faulty modeling. For example, they rely a lot on a 1996 study that does not even address reduced production compressors, so they can't even really give us any true information on reciprocating versus the other — the compressors. So if you're going to be relying on that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	things that it's really our perspective that that's really kind of in the Clean Air Act realm, not BLM. So I just wonder if you could explain to the audience here where you feel your jurisdiction is around regulating air quality. I think that would be helpful, too. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: Well, I think that's that is a part of the discussion that we have going forward. BLM has signed an NMOU with EPA on air emissions and studies and that sort of thing in the last several years. So and then our authorities I think clearly fall under the royalty and waste, the conservation piece, that it's hard to separate some of the two. Some of the things that you could do for conservation of resource also have a benefit to, you know, air quality. So it's hard to divide a fine line, say, "Well, if it has anything to do with air quality, then we can't touch it." So it's part of this discussion, part of what we go through in talking with our legal folks and have that type of conversation internally. Certainly they thought some ideas that are going to come from you all on both sides well, many sides; it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	things. And obviously, they're still in they're not even peer-reviewed. They're going through the peer review process right now. And my conversations with the EPA are that, you know, it's kind of a work in progress for okay, so I don't think you are working with them, and I understand that you believe that your jurisdiction is different than the EPA's when it comes to the Air Quality Act, but since you are both talking about pneumatics and leaks and offloading and all that stuff, then I hope that you look not only at their peer-reviewed study but also the spin. One of the comments I'm going to be making to the EPA concerning those white papers is that I don't especially like some of the studies that they've relied upon and some of the modeling that they've done. I think that they have based some of their recent study conclusions on some faulty modeling. For example, they rely a lot on a 1996 study that does not even address reduced production compressors, so they can't even really give us any true information on reciprocating versus the other the compressors.

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

Page 46 Page 48 1 1 from industry. plants. 2 2 MS. LANCE: Sure. And, I mean, what I'm There was an independent peer-reviewed 3 trying to convey is we want to be as open as possible to 3 study that was done on Garfield County, which is up in 4 considering everything that's already been done so that 4 Colorado, which is why they might be moving towards 5 we're not starting over, but at the same time, getting 5 stricter controls up there. It was done over three 6 6 new input on any of that work for anything else that you years. And in Garfield County, there's a close 7 want to authorize. So that's why we're starting here 7 approximation between the oil -- the path that they're 8 rather than doing a proposed rule and kind of handing it 8 doing for hydraulic fracturing now and people's homes. 9 to you and saying, "What do you think?" 9 This exploratory study was designed to 10 10 So I encourage you to do that, and it would assess air quality in this rural Western Colorado area. 11 And what they found in a sampling after a year ago is 11 be wonderful if whenever you comment on what other 12 that the number of nonmethane hydrocarbons were highest 12 agencies or states have done, send it, yeah, because 13 13 we're in good touch with I think all the states that are during the initial drilling phase and did not increase 14 working in this area. We've had really good discussions 14 but stayed the same during the ongoing fracturing with them, and the same with these people. But, you 15 15 process. 16 16 Methylene chloride is a toxic solvent not know, it would be very helpful, just so we don't miss 17 17 something when you guys send anything to those guys on reported in products used in drilling or hydraulic 18 18 fracturing. So this also has -- they show that it these issues. 19 MS. FOSTER: Okay. Great. And reciprocal 19 has -- 73 percent of the time, methylene chloride is 20 20 was the word I was looking for. there, and several times in higher concentrations. 21 21 MR. SPISAK: Reciprocal. And what they're showing is that the VOC's 22 22 MS. FOSTER: And reciprocating. that are borne out into our air actually cause, for 23 23 MS. AMSTUTZ: My name is Anita Amstutz and prenatal children in urban studies, lower development 24 24 and IQ scores, but even lower development in those rural I'm speaking on behalf of New Mexico Interfaith Power 25 25 and Light. Perhaps I'm going to bring a different slant areas where they were exposed to these kinds of high Page 47 Page 49 1 to the conversation. I represent faith communities, not 1 emissions. 2 only 40 states across the country but also 89 churches, 2 I want to just say that, in bringing, 3 3 at least, in this state that are working with climate again, a different twist to this, some of you might know 4 change issues. 4 Wendell Berry, who's a Kentucky farmer; he's also a poet 5 So I realize it's inconvenient for the 5 and environmental ethicist. And what he talks about is 6 petroleum industry to look at any kinds of things that 6 boomers and stickers. Boomers are motivated by greed, 7 7 the desire for money, property, and therefore power. would limit, you know, offgasing and venting and 8 flaring. I appreciate that you have a time for us to 8 Boomers go and pillage in absentia. They're sent to 9 speak to this, so I'm really speaking to the citizens, 9 wherever the getting is good, get as much as they can 10 10 take and leave. and I feel it's an underrepresented voice in this room, 11 11 and perhaps in these kinds of boardrooms around the Stickers, on the other hand, are motivated 12 12 by affection, by love for the place they live and the country. 13 13 life that they want to preserve. And I'm asking us to So I'm here because of the loss of methane, 14 as you've been talking about, and the high VOC's that 14 think about preservation of seven generations hence, 15 are going into our atmosphere. And, you know, despite 15 when we have sent that much of our carbon emissions into 16 the economic inconvenience of putting regulation on 16 the air and destroyed it. 17 those, I think it's going to be more economically 17 He said his grandfather shared in the 18 18 virtues and faults of his generation. He was a sticker. inconvenient when we look at the desecration of our 19 water, air and soil to the citizenry over time. 19 And I would ask that those of us that live in the West 20 The most recent U.S. greenhouse gas 20 think of ourselves as stickers, that we want to preserve 21 21 and care for the land as if we're going to live here and inventory shows that the oil and gas industry leaked, 22 22 vented or flared approximately 8.4 million metric tons our generations going forward are going to have to live 23 of methane in 2011, and that's provided by the 23 here with whatever water, air and soil that we leave for 24 24 them. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. That's equal 25 25 So I ask for us to think about that as we to the amount of emissions from 204 coal-fired power

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

Page 52 Page 50 1 1 where Teddy Roosevelt National Historical Park is consider any kind of regulations. They should be in 2 2 located, that park protects the ranch that Teddy line with what EPA standards are, and I ask that we 3 think about what that means, even if it's inconvenient 3 Roosevelt built for himself out there before he became 4 for the petroleum industry, because the citizens of this 4 president, and that those experiences in North Dakota 5 country and the citizens of this state want clean air 5 really formulated his environmental ethic that led to a 6 6 lot of the things that he did as president such as and water and soil. 7 7 establishing Grand Canyon as a national monument. And maybe this shows my ignorance, but I 8 wonder why in the first place we allow oil and gas 8 Today the night sky in Teddy Roosevelt 9 9 drilling on public land. It seems to be a breach of National Park has been lost because of the flaring 10 10 public tax dollars as well as public health and trust. activities, and those activities are so bright that they 11 So I'm wondering -- if we're going to allow this, we 11 can be seen from the International Space Station. 12 12 should uphold the highest standards. So I encourage you to think about those 13 13 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. kinds of resources that are valuable not only to people 14 Yes, ma'am? 14 but environmentally, to wildlife migration, reproduction MS. PAYNE: Good afternoon. My name is 15 15 and hunting strategies. There are all sorts of values 16 16 that go with night sky, something a lot of us have kind Cherry Payne. I represent an organization called Park 17 17 Rangers for Our Lands. I've retired from the National of lost touch with. 18 Park Service after 35 years, and those of you who are 18 However, to end it all, I would like to say 19 still in the federal trenches, I thank you, and 19 that Park Rangers for Our Lands is appreciative of all 20 20 retirement is great. the work that you are doing to address this issue, and 21 MS. LANCE: Don't say that to any of these 21 we're willing to support you in any way we can so that 22 22 we can preserve night skies throughout the United guys. 23 23 MS. PAYNE: I do want to talk about States. 24 resources protected by the American people and the 24 Thank you. 25 federal government, the National Park Service that's not 25 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. Page 51 Page 53 1 been mentioned in the forum so far. And I find it 1 MR. VENEKLASEN: Hi, my name is Garrett 2 appropriate you're holding meetings both here in New 2 VeneKlasen. I'm the executive director of the New 3 Mexico and in North Dakota. And there are two parks --3 Mexican Wildlife Federation. We're one of the oldest 4 two National Parks that I think are object lessons to 4 conservation organizations in the nation. We were 5 the issues -- some of the issues that you're addressing 5 started by Aldo Leopold 100 years ago this year. 6 here today and then this effort. 6 Our membership is made up of hunters and 7 The first is Chaco Cultural National 7 anglers, and the hunting and angling industry in New 8 Historical Park, located not far from here. It's been 8 Mexico generates about 600 million dollars a year, and 9 protected for over 100 years by the American people 9 it really helps to diversify rural economies. And one 10 because of the incredible cultural resources that are 10 of our concerns is we're in a twelve-year drought, and 11 found there. However, within the last year, another 11 especially our big game herds are in trouble, especially 12 resource for that park has been recognized as a natural 12 our mule deer herds. Some of our best mule deer herds 13 resource, and that's the night sky. Just in the last 13 are up in the Four Corners area. 14 14 August, I believe it was, the International Dark Sky In 2010, the Government Accountability 15 Association named Chaco as one of -- as an International 15 Office found that the public loses up to 23 million 16 Dark Sky Park, one of only four so named in the United dollars annually in royalties from venting and flaring. 16 17 States and 14 in the world. 17 We'd like to see a portion of that money go to world 18 The ability to see the night sky is a lost 18 habitat restoration and mitigation. And a perfect 19 resource all over this country, and we're losing it in 19 example of this, the San Juan River generates 40 million 20 the West. But if you or I or any of us or your family 20 dollars a year just in angling revenue, but it is 21 members went to Chaco today, you could enjoy the night 21 chronically impacted by sediment runoff from the -- all 22 sky and see the Milky Way and the majesty of the night 22 the fragmented country up there. 23 sky much as the people who built and lived in Chaco did 23 And so we see this as a real opportunity to 24 24 1,000 years ago. take a portion of that lost revenue and put it back onto 25 25 Conversely, if you go to North Dakota, the land and give it to not only the fish and game herds

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

	Page 54		Page 56
1	that we're most concerned about, but to the nongame	1	just again, I've heard it said several times
2	species that inhabit the area. It's a sustainable	2	encourage you to look at the EPA Quad O, which I hear
3	resource that we think can move New Mexico forward far	3	you are, because I'm already doing that.
4	into the future. So we'd like you all to consider that.	4	I'd encourage you to consider the Colorado
5	Thank you very much.	5	rules, what they're doing with their quality rules,
6	MR. SPISAK: Thank you.	6	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.
7	MR. TRUJILLO: My name is Max Trujillo.	7	You know, again, they do take on a lot of the EPA stuff
8	I'm with HECHO, Hispanics Enjoying Camping, Hunting and	8	for the State of Colorado.
9	the Outdoors, and I echo Garrett's sentiments.	9	So I'd just encourage you to continue to
10	And I understand the frustration from the	10	work with these other federal agencies as well, more
11	petroleum industry, and I, too, am asking that BLM not	11	importantly, really, the state agencies, and avoid any
12	compromise the tools that you have in place to oversee	12	duplication if at all possible in terms of reporting
13	and regulate this industry. It seems that we're	13	requirements. That may or may not come.
14	always you know, just a common citizen, we're always	14	I'd also just like to you know, again,
15	bending to the oil and gas industry.	15	as an industry, we're very mindful of waste, obviously.
16	I would ask, you know, New Mexico	16	I mean, we, at all costs, try to get it into the line as
17	there's two things in New Mexico that we're rich in, is	17	soon as possible. So, I mean, our interest is in tying
18	culture and public land. I would ask that that, too, be	18	into the gas line prior to completion if at all
19	considered moving forward in this plan revision.	19	possible. That's not always possible.
20	And when it you know, when it comes to	20	But I'd encourage you to continue to reach
21	oil and gas, I completely understand that the country is	21	out to the pipeline and the midstream companies because
22	in a mandate to produce more. But the BLM, the	22	as the hydraulic fracturing technology improves, less
23	Department of the Interior also, have some very	23	and less water is being used, but other gases are being
24	excellent tools in your bag to regulate and to protect	24	used, and there's occasions where pipelines will not let
25	what's left of the habitat, of our clean water, and I	25	you into the gas line until, for example, you've vented
	Page 55		Page 5'
1	Page 55 would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to	1	_
1 2	•	1 2	Page 5' or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example.
	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree.		or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things
2	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to	2	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure
2 3	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you.	2 3	of that example.
2 3 4	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll	2 3 4	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as
2 3 4 5	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got	2 3 4 5	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir?
2 3 4 5 6	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail	2 3 4 5 6	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's	2 3 4 5 6 7	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that has information about these sessions, includes the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting. MR. SPISAK: Will we see you up there next
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that has information about these sessions, includes the agendas. It will be the PowerPoints, the transcripts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting. MR. SPISAK: Will we see you up there next week or Friday?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that has information about these sessions, includes the agendas. It will be the PowerPoints, the transcripts from the public sessions, and links to the videos from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting. MR. SPISAK: Will we see you up there next week or Friday? MR. ABE: You're going to see some of my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that has information about these sessions, includes the agendas. It will be the PowerPoints, the transcripts from the public sessions, and links to the videos from the Denver meeting and the Washington meeting. So for a resource, go and look. MR. LOPEZ: Chris Lopez with DJ Simmons,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting. MR. SPISAK: Will we see you up there next week or Friday? MR. ABE: You're going to see some of my relatives for sure. But some of the concerns that our tribe has been facing — and I hear about it on a daily basis, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that has information about these sessions, includes the agendas. It will be the PowerPoints, the transcripts from the public sessions, and links to the videos from the Denver meeting and the Washington meeting. So for a resource, go and look.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting. MR. SPISAK: Will we see you up there next week or Friday? MR. ABE: You're going to see some of my relatives for sure. But some of the concerns that our tribe has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that has information about these sessions, includes the agendas. It will be the PowerPoints, the transcripts from the public sessions, and links to the videos from the Denver meeting and the Washington meeting. So for a resource, go and look. MR. LOPEZ: Chris Lopez with DJ Simmons,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting. MR. SPISAK: Will we see you up there next week or Friday? MR. ABE: You're going to see some of my relatives for sure. But some of the concerns that our tribe has been facing — and I hear about it on a daily basis, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that has information about these sessions, includes the agendas. It will be the PowerPoints, the transcripts from the public sessions, and links to the videos from the Denver meeting and the Washington meeting. So for a resource, go and look. MR. LOPEZ: Chris Lopez with DJ Simmons, Incorporated, an independent oil company in the Four	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting. MR. SPISAK: Will we see you up there next week or Friday? MR. ABE: You're going to see some of my relatives for sure. But some of the concerns that our tribe has been facing — and I hear about it on a daily basis, you know — they're concerned about the amount of flaring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that has information about these sessions, includes the agendas. It will be the PowerPoints, the transcripts from the public sessions, and links to the videos from the Denver meeting and the Washington meeting. So for a resource, go and look. MR. LOPEZ: Chris Lopez with DJ Simmons, Incorporated, an independent oil company in the Four Corners region.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting. MR. SPISAK: Will we see you up there next week or Friday? MR. ABE: You're going to see some of my relatives for sure. But some of the concerns that our tribe has been facing and I hear about it on a daily basis, you know they're concerned about the amount of flaring that's going on. On our reservation, we have about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that has information about these sessions, includes the agendas. It will be the PowerPoints, the transcripts from the public sessions, and links to the videos from the Denver meeting and the Washington meeting. So for a resource, go and look. MR. LOPEZ: Chris Lopez with DJ Simmons, Incorporated, an independent oil company in the Four Corners region. I just want to echo a lot of what I've been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting. MR. SPISAK: Will we see you up there next week or Friday? MR. ABE: You're going to see some of my relatives for sure. But some of the concerns that our tribe has been facing and I hear about it on a daily basis, you know they're concerned about the amount of flaring that's going on. On our reservation, we have about 1,100-plus wells, Bakken wells, and about 40 to 50
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	would encourage you not to compromise those tools and to enforce them to the strongest degree. Thank you. MR. SPISAK: While he's coming up, I'll just mention real quick I mentioned we've got comments for session until May 30th. There's the e-mail address up on the web up on the screen there. It's on your PowerPoint also. And the date is Friday, next week. And for further information, on the website, there's a public events on oil and gas on the Energy and the Oil and Gas tabs under the BLM page that has information about these sessions, includes the agendas. It will be the PowerPoints, the transcripts from the public sessions, and links to the videos from the Denver meeting and the Washington meeting. So for a resource, go and look. MR. LOPEZ: Chris Lopez with DJ Simmons, Incorporated, an independent oil company in the Four Corners region. I just want to echo a lot of what I've been hearing folks saying in terms of regulatory duplication.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or flared a certain quantity of nitrogen or other things of that example. So I would encourage you to also make sure you've got midstream operators in this conversation as well. MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir? MR. ABE: Hi. My name is George Abbe, spelled A-B-E, and I want to thank BLM for sponsoring this public dialogue. I'm also a tribal member of the three affiliated tribes of North Dakota, and I'm also a mineral owner, but I've, you know, been down here for a long time, and I heard about this meeting. MR. SPISAK: Will we see you up there next week or Friday? MR. ABE: You're going to see some of my relatives for sure. But some of the concerns that our tribe has been facing — and I hear about it on a daily basis, you know — they're concerned about the amount of flaring that's going on. On our reservation, we have about 1,100-plus wells, Bakken wells, and about 40 to 50 percent of them are being flaring right now, which is in

Page 58 Page 60 1 1 And I also wanted to say that BLM should change. 2 2 probably have to take a look at the extensions that are And one of the things that I think the BLM 3 being granted companies to continue such. But we 3 can do is look at strong national methane waste 4 anticipate 2,000 to 4,000 additional wells on the 4 standards for our public lands. The Government 5 reservation, according to the North Dakota Industrial 5 Accountability Office concluded in 2010 that poor, 6 6 outdated BLM policies facilitate the tremendous waste of Commission, and so I think perhaps going forward, we 7 could take a look at doing a better job to capture those 7 natural gas. 8 8 The GAO also estimated that BLM could gases. 9 9 And that's all I have to say. economically eliminate up to 40 percent of the natural 10 10 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. gas currently wasted from drilling and other oil and gas 11 Yes, sir? 11 operations on BLM-managed land. More recent studies 12 12 MR. CURTIS: Hi there, my name is Alex suggest that reductions in the neighborhood of 80 13 13 Curtis. I'm the research director for ProgressNow New percent or even higher are feasible. I think we have to look at the totality of 14 Mexico. We are a progressive advocacy organization 14 here. We represent over 100,000 subscribers in New 15 15 the effect of what we're doing to our atmosphere. And I 16 16 believe that it truly is an economic issue, but it's a Mexico. 17 17 holistic economic issue. We must see the cost in its And I just wanted to come up and first 18 thank the BLM for holding this forum. I think this is a 18 totality, not just the cost to bring these extractive 19 very productive forum, and I think we're having a 19 industries up, but also who's making money, what's the 20 20 profit, but what's also the cost on the other side in productive discussion. Obviously, we represent a more 21 progressive viewpoint on some of these things, but I 21 public health and in our very life on this planet. 22 think that what's becoming clear is that we're all here 22 So I would suggest that -- I would 23 23 more concerned about efficiency in these processes, so I encourage BLM to review the group Amigos Bravos that 24 just wanted to just repeat some of the things that have 24 presented their report on January 27th, 2014 -- it was 25 25 been said before just about that and sort of emphasize directed to the Honorable Sally Jewell -- telling them Page 59 Page 61 1 that our subscribers and the people that we speak to are 1 what kinds of possibilities we could do. 2 very concerned with these efficiency -- with having 2 So I'm really hoping that BLM will really 3 3 efficiency in these processes, and especially New begin to integrate the -- a group that can integrate all 4 Mexicans are particularly concerned here because of the 4 the agencies, all the regulations, etcetera, and that we 5 (inaudible) that obviously, royalties are used in New 5 have a comprehensive policy that's going to help us 6 Mexico in terms of public funding of education and other 6 mitigate the effects of climate change and the 7 7 temperature rise that methane is giving us. services. 8 So I just wanted to say that the work here, 8 So I thank you for this opportunity, and I 9 we're very thankful for this opportunity and that we 9 encourage you to continue to get a comprehensive policy. 10 will be encouraging our subscribers to participate in 10 Thank you. 11 11 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. the comment period now until the end of the month. 12 Thank you. 12 Yes, sir? 13 MR. SPISAK: Very good. Thank you. 13 MR. EISENFELD: My name is Mike Eisenfeld. 14 14 I'm with San Juan Citizens Alliance from Farmington. Yes, ma'am? 15 MS. PERROTTE: Good afternoon. I am 15 Can you go back to the last slide, please. 16 Marlene Perrotte, and I'm a Sister of Mercy, and I'm On the venting and flaring public outreach, 16 17 speaking on behalf of the Partnership for Earth 17 the leak detection and repair, as a result of the 2010 18 settlement with BLM, Farmington has infrared cameras, 18 19 Yesterday, the White House released the 19 and they sort of know what BLM's responsibility is on 20 report on climate change assessment. And in there, it 20 inspection of the facilities. And you all can answer 21 21 that later. spoke about the human-induced issues with respect to 22 22 The other point I'd like to sort of in gases, and spoke especially about methane. And I think 23 today's hearings and those that are going to follow this 23 answer to is that there's an immense amount of flaring 24 really address what the report said. It said that we do 24 going on in the Lybrook and Counselor areas. What's the 25 25 still have a chance to mitigate the worst of climate interim policy going to be while we're waiting for BLM

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

Page 62 Page 64 1 to formulate policies and rulemaking? 1 emissions are harming our air quality, principally by 2 And third, we have until May 30th on 2 the constituents of natural gas is a potent greenhouse 3 comments. That's a couple weeks away, a few weeks away. 3 gas, more than 80 times as potent as carbon dioxide over 4 What assurances do we have on BLM's deadline? When will 4 a 20-year time horizon. 5 BLM have this ready to go and implemented? 5 Oil and gas production and processing 6 MR. SPISAK: I'll check the last one first. 6 accounts for nearly 40 percent of methane emissions in 7 7 the United States, making it the single largest methane We don't have a set time frame when you come out with a 8 proposed rule, but it is the next priority after the 8 source in the nation. Any BLM rules must significantly 9 9 hydraulic fracturing rule that we've been working on. curb dangerous air pollution from oil and gas operations 10 10 So I cannot commit to a particular time for that, but while reducing methane emissions that contribute to 11 that is the next thing -- we're working on now, but 11 climate change. 12 we'll move it up in the priority. 12 The industry has cost-effective 13 The second item, on those particular 13 technologies to reduce and capture methane. Often these 14 locations, I'm not familiar with. It sounds like it was 14 appear to pay for themselves by conserving more of our 15 more Farmington-specific. I don't know if somebody from 15 resource gas companies sell. 16 Farmington here wants to speak to that, about their use 16 And in closing, I would just like to 17 17 of the infrared cameras or not. encourage those to get the Sierra Club's recent climate 18 18 disruption report -- and it features one of sites here I know that they did a pilot effort of 19 19 in the (inaudible) part of the state called the Mancos looking at the usability or the effectiveness of the 20 20 Shale/Gallup Formation -- and encourage you to read that infrared cameras. And that's where we got a lot of the 21 feedback about they're good at identifying leaks but not 21 as well. 22 necessarily quantifying whether one leak was bigger than 22 Thank you. 23 23 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. the other, where you could focus a time to fix the leaks 24 or not. That's one of the things I mentioned earlier 24 MR. LOOSE: I'm Verne Loose. I'm also a 25 about limitations to the infrared technology. 25 member of the Rio Grande Chapter of the Sierra Club. Page 63 Page 65 1 MR. EISENFELD: Yeah, the area that I am 1 And in your slide, there's lots of mention 2 talking about is in the Farmington field office, 2 about the economics analysis to be done. I presume that 3 3 Lybrook, Counselor. It's -- we're seeing an increased that is an analysis of the economics of methane and 4 amount of flaring very quickly, and we need an interim 4 venting and flaring. 5 5 And I'd like to make a couple of comments. 6 MR. SPISAK: The current policy is the 6 I'd like to encourage the BLM to consider carefully the 7 NTL-4A requiring approval, correct. And that's what we 7 geographic scope at which that analysis is done - I 8 have so far. The timing on anything changing from that 8 think that was mentioned before in the comments -- and 9 and this new rule we'll take under advisement. 9 that the appropriateness of getting the geographic scope 10 MR. EISENFELD: Thank you. 10 really affects the economics dramatically. 11 MR. SPISAK: Sure. 11 And also, in that same vein, the 12 Yes, sir? 12 appropriate entity that is responsible for doing that 13 MR. TOHE: Hi, my name is Robert Tohe. I'm 13 analysis should be carefully considered as well. It 14 14 with Sierra Club, and I wanted to make some comments on seems to be that in most cases, it would be the 15 the hearings. 15 leaseholder: that's where the economic interest lies. 16 If you remember, last June, President Obama 16 But that should be considered. 17 recognized methane as a critical threat to our climate 17 The second comment about the economics that 18 in his climate action plan. And he said, "Curbing 18 I'd like to make is reflecting the request of a couple 19 methane emissions is critical to our overall efforts to 19 of speakers ago to make sure that the analysis -- the 20 address climate change. It is time for the BLM to lead 20 economic analysis is comprehensive. And in order for it 21 the way on taking action on this critical issue." 21 to be comprehensive, the analysis would have to reflect 22 22 Given the rapid growth of oil and gas the cost to the environment of venting and flaring. You 23 (inaudible), this rulemaking is a critical opportunity 23 will never reject that as an economic action if you 24 for much-needed commonsense protection in places to 24 don't reflect the damage to the environment causing both 25 preserve air quality and protect public health. Methane 25 the deterioration of the air quality and visibility as

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

	Page 66		Page 6
1	well as the long-term effects of climate change.	1	MR. SPISAK: Yes, sir?
2	So that factor has to be incorporated into	2	MR. SINGER: Tom Singer with the Western
3	the analysis in order to have the comprehensive view of	3	Environmental Law Center.
4	the economics of venting and flaring.	4	I've been thinking about your answer to the
5	Thank you.	5	question about the scope of the gas capture planning and
6	MR. SPISAK: Thank you.	6	focusing on individual wells in a lease site, and I just
7	Dan?	7	wondered if you could share some of BLM's thinking, some
8	MR. GIRAND: Dan Girand.	8	of your thinking on the following questions.
9	I have lived in New Mexico all my life. I	9	And one is sort of the aggravation of
10	grew up in the oilfield, been there for 76 years. It	10	well-level production forecast and how much production
11	put me through college. I came up to UNM, went to the	11	might be coming off of a field in (inaudible) or
12	Air Force, came back. In spite of what some people	12	whatever. And then these are related to Slide 18 and
13	think, nothing wrong with me.	13	19.
14	And I don't know anybody classmates from	14	But again, you're thinking about the
15	all over the world, UNM, Hobbs High School; nobody has	15	gathering and processing infrastructure to determine
16	been sick from the oilfield. Come on, that's	16	things that you mentioned in your potential course of
17	(inaudible). I've never heard of it before.	17	action slides. There was mention of authorizing flaring
18	It's and if we didn't have petroleum	18	with the operator's commitment to install gathering
19	products, folks, you'd all be standing or sitting on the	19	infrastructure. And when you're talking about a, you
20	floor. We wouldn't have any of this. Probably you	20	know, given well site or given operator, I just wonder
21	wouldn't have clothes on because there's plastic in the	21	what that means.
22	clothes. Your house would be empty. Your car would be	22	You talked about the ability of BLM to
23	a frame, and you'd sit in a metal chair. There's a	23	refine the definition of unavoidably lost gas. And
24	huge, huge market that is served by oil and gas and the	24	again, from that single well perspective, how does that
25	products from that.	25	work?
	Page 67		Page 6
1	What do we do? We've lived here in New	1	And then you talked about conditional
2	Mexico of course I know some people say there's	2	approval of APD's and infrastructure will be ready soon.
3	and the test of the state of th		approvar of the B state infrastructure will be ready soons
ی	nothing in the southeast that's worth looking at anyway,	3	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can
3 4	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it		
		3	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can
4	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it	3 4	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering,
4 5	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged.	3 4 5	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in?
4 5 6	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you	3 4 5 6	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to
4 5 6 7	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that	3 4 5 6 7	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from
4 5 6 7 8	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every	3 4 5 6 7 8	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and
4 5 6 7 8 9	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team. And that's just one example of what the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere. So there's got to be flexibility built into
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team. And that's just one example of what the people who live there do that negates the (inaudible)	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere. So there's got to be flexibility built into a process that allows a certain amount of discretion
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team. And that's just one example of what the people who live there do that negates the (inaudible) problems. I invite you to come to Artesia and look	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere. So there's got to be flexibility built into a process that allows a certain amount of discretion worked around general principles that may be articulated
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team. And that's just one example of what the people who live there do that negates the (inaudible) problems. I invite you to come to Artesia and look around and see what that town looks like and what the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere. So there's got to be flexibility built into a process that allows a certain amount of discretion worked around general principles that may be articulated in the regulation, but with clear goals and objectives
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team. And that's just one example of what the people who live there do that negates the (inaudible) problems. I invite you to come to Artesia and look around and see what that town looks like and what the oilfield did there. We didn't get our community we	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere. So there's got to be flexibility built into a process that allows a certain amount of discretion worked around general principles that may be articulated in the regulation, but with clear goals and objectives on what we're trying to build. Now, probably this
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team. And that's just one example of what the people who live there do that negates the (inaudible) problems. I invite you to come to Artesia and look around and see what that town looks like and what the oilfield did there. We didn't get our community we didn't take from the state of New Mexico, the federal	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere. So there's got to be flexibility built into a process that allows a certain amount of discretion worked around general principles that may be articulated in the regulation, but with clear goals and objectives on what we're trying to build. Now, probably this doesn't say a whole lot, and maybe that's by design.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team. And that's just one example of what the people who live there do that negates the (inaudible) problems. I invite you to come to Artesia and look around and see what that town looks like and what the oilfield did there. We didn't get our community we didn't take from the state of New Mexico, the federal government.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying — recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere. So there's got to be flexibility built into a process that allows a certain amount of discretion worked around general principles that may be articulated in the regulation, but with clear goals and objectives on what we're trying to build. Now, probably this doesn't say a whole lot, and maybe that's by design. But part of that is looking at this stuff and trying to
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team. And that's just one example of what the people who live there do that negates the (inaudible) problems. I invite you to come to Artesia and look around and see what that town looks like and what the oilfield did there. We didn't get our community we didn't take from the state of New Mexico, the federal government. Yeah, we make a living. Some make a good	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere. So there's got to be flexibility built into a process that allows a certain amount of discretion worked around general principles that may be articulated in the regulation, but with clear goals and objectives on what we're trying to build. Now, probably this doesn't say a whole lot, and maybe that's by design. But part of that is looking at this stuff and trying to come together with something that will work and do what
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't — but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf — artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team. And that's just one example of what the people who live there do that negates the (inaudible) problems. I invite you to come to Artesia and look around and see what that town looks like and what the oilfield did there. We didn't get our community — we didn't take from the state of New Mexico, the federal government. Yeah, we make a living. Some make a good living, some of them just get along. But we're out	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere. So there's got to be flexibility built into a process that allows a certain amount of discretion worked around general principles that may be articulated in the regulation, but with clear goals and objectives on what we're trying to build. Now, probably this doesn't say a whole lot, and maybe that's by design. But part of that is looking at this stuff and trying to come together with something that will work and do what we're trying to do.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	but we kind of like it. But it hasn't changed; it hasn't been damaged. I don't know; maybe you can't but, you know, what do the independent oil and gas producers that live here in New Mexico do? My employer sent every single high school child to college and has for the last six years, all of them, anybody that wants to. We have a turf artificial turf on our football field in Artesia. We donated buses to the football team. And that's just one example of what the people who live there do that negates the (inaudible) problems. I invite you to come to Artesia and look around and see what that town looks like and what the oilfield did there. We didn't get our community we didn't take from the state of New Mexico, the federal government. Yeah, we make a living. Some make a good living, some of them just get along. But we're out there producing something, and it's the producers in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	So how are you thinking of aggregating so that you can answer some of those questions about when the gathering, (inaudible) and processing infrastructure gets put in? MR. SPISAK: Well, part of that is going to be part of the response to the feedback that we get from folks such as yourself, what states like Colorado and Wyoming and others might be doing. And it's an aggregate of those, at the same time trying recognizing that it's difficult to come up with a way that's going to work everywhere. So there's got to be flexibility built into a process that allows a certain amount of discretion worked around general principles that may be articulated in the regulation, but with clear goals and objectives on what we're trying to build. Now, probably this doesn't say a whole lot, and maybe that's by design. But part of that is looking at this stuff and trying to come together with something that will work and do what we're trying to do. MR. SINGER: All right. I appreciate your

18 (Pages 66 to 69)

Page 70 Page 72 1 Hispanics Enjoying Camping, Hunting and Outdoors. 1 having sinkholes? Is this causing climate change? 2 I just want to say that it's true we 2 You know, at one time, coal was a big 3 do -- we have all used petroleum products and we do use 3 issue. I think there's some lobbying restrictions now 4 petroleum products to heat our homes and all of that. 4 for coal. There probably is for gas and oil, maybe for 5 And I think one of the things that happens sometimes in 5 wind and solar. 6 conversations like this is that we stop looking at 6 The gas and oil is not a renewable source. 7 balance and we start looking at one side or the other. 7 I would like to see something implemented to 8 And I think what HECHO stands for is 8 supplement -- I realize we'll always have a need for the 9 9 balance. We want to ensure that the places that are gas and oil, but I'd like to see us use less of it and 10 10 important to Latino sportsmen, our communities, our try to replace it with something on the solar or the wind area. 11 cultural -- traditional cultural users of the land, our 11 12 12 curanderas, our artists, still have access to places One of my big questions is what happens to 13 that are free of pollution, that have clean water, 13 all those empty spots under the ground that we're 14 healthy herds and areas that still reflect the long 14 pumping all the oil and all the water out of? And I 15 history of open lands and beautiful landscapes, healthy 15 think the fracturing and the whatever it's called, 16 16 they're loosening up a lot of those rocks that I landscapes. 17 And so when we move forward in making plans 17 understood is holding it all up. That's a major concern 18 for drilling and oil and gas development, we want to 18 19 ensure that all the communities have a voice in the 19 As you know, I'm not a geologist or 20 process and that, wherever it's possible, to use 20 anything like that. So I understand that the methane 21 commonsense means of protecting the land. Existing 21 gas is very dangerous, but we've been having it for 22 years and years; I would like to see it be able to be technologies or newly-developed technologies that can 22 23 save waste, create healthier air and protect the people 23 captured and put into something. 24 24 who live around drilled areas, we should go for those I came across a Western Renewable Energy 25 kinds of processes. 25 Study from 2011, I believe it is -- no, 2009, and they Page 71 Page 73 1 As my colleague Max mentioned earlier, 1 said that the state of New Mexico -- all over the state 2 everything that's available to us to use to recapture 2 of New Mexico, from the very northern, southern, eastern 3 the gas, to make sure that nothing that hasn't been 3 and western borders, that our number one resource is the 4 combusted is released into the air, if the technology is 4 solar and the wind, for the renewable capacity. I'd 5 there, we should use it, and we should look at ways to 5 love to see some of that implemented in with this study 6 enable the companies that are, you know, 6 to make sure that we have the gas and oil that we will 7 developing -- development companies to use it. If the 7 need. 8 smaller developers need help, then maybe there needs to 8 Thank you. 9 be some means in our government to find ways to help 9 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. And the answer to 10 them figure out how to have cleaner processes. 10 your question is yes, no, no, yes, yes, and yes. I'm 11 11 kidding. Thank you, thank you. In the meantime, we want to ensure that 12 certain areas are set aside and kept free of development 12 Any other questions? 13 so that we can continue to use them in the ways that 13 Sir? 14 14 MR. SCHLENKER-GOODRICH: Hi, Erik we've used them for centuries. 15 15 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. Schlenker-Goodrich. I just wanted to note, I did not Ma'am? 16 anticipate hearing a quote from Wendell Perry today out 16 17 MS. McMAHAN: Hi, I'm Trina McMahan. I'm 17 of Oil and Gas Venting and Flaring Forum. I very much 18 just a person from the community; I'm not with any 18 appreciate that quote. 19 organization. I hope this all works out well for 19 Erik Schlenker-Goodrich again with Western 20 everyone. I can't help but believe that it will. 20 Environmental Law Center. 21 21 There's so many interested people. I want to emphasize some sympathy to 22 22 I'm wondering, when are we going to run out Mr. Girand's point about natural gas, that we all rely 23 of the gas and the oil? That's one of my big concerns. 23 on petroleum products. You know, I cook with natural 24 And I realize that there's implications of contaminating 24 gas in my home. I think that's what's fascinating about 25 25

19 (Pages 70 to 73)

the aquifer. Is this causing earthquakes? Are we

this issue and how it is very much low-hanging fruit.

Page 74

No, what we're talking about is trying to keep that thing from going into the atmosphere and keeping it so that it can in fact be used by someone like myself in my stove. And so there is a real opportunity here, I think, to find common ground between the environmental community, a group that I represent in my own work in addition, as well with the oil and gas industry.

I think there's been some success both in terms of EPA's Quad O rules as well as in some of the state rulemaking processes that define some common ground where we can accommodate each other's interests while ensuring that we're protecting our atmosphere and ensuring that we are protecting the oil and gas resource on public lands.

I think that's also a really critical point to remember here: We're talking about federal oil and gas resources. These are resources that are held in trust for the public. There's been a lot of discussion about the economics involved in capturing gas. The economics really need to be driven by public trust economics, taking into account the fact that we are not here simply to exploit the federal oil and gas resource in the short term but to manage it over the long term for the greatest benefit of the American society.

Page 76

feel like some of the national arguments that are being made against BLM or EPA proceeding with addressing methane from this industry and maybe saying — New Mexico is smart enough to understand we've got to do something about methane, but there are some national arguments that are being made.

One argument that's being made is that methane isn't that significant. And, you know, that argument was made in the Massey EPA case. I just stepped down from teaching environmental law, and the argument was, oh, it isn't that important. And the U.S. Supreme Court, the majority said it may not be that important, but we've got to go after each piece. One estimate is that methane emissions from oil and gas equal 204 coal-burning -- coal-fired power plants in terms of the importance of the greenhouse gases because of the potency of methane.

Another argument that's been made a little bit here is that the data are inadequate. And I've been doing environmental regulation for about 35 years in New Mexico. We often hear that we don't know enough.

I think the notion that we wait for the Quad O rules to go into effect, in terms of monitoring methane emissions, we really don't need to do so. What we're concerned with in this meeting and we're concerned

Page 75

So thinking about those economywide economics, those public trust economics, accounting for the social cost of methane waste and venting to the atmosphere. So that economic issue will be very, very critical.

Thank you.

MR. SPISAK: Thank you.

MS. BOYD: I'm Denise Boyd, and I'm a

volunteer for the Sierra Club.

I wondered if all the Sierra Club volunteers that are here could just raise your hands just to acknowledge the people who came. Thank you very much. There are a few staff people, and there's a lot more people than I expected to see at this hearing generally.

I want to convey the urgency that we feel about climate change, climate destruction in the public at large. And I think for everybody here who lives in the Southwest, we're feeling it right now as things are drying up; we're feeling it with the fire dangers that are upon us.

The president's actions in declaring methane to be of critical concern are ones that hearten me, and I would almost like to -- Eric made such a positive note, I don't want to undo it at all, but I

Page 77

with the EPA moving forward is going after existing sources. We've got lots of data, not enough data, but we've got enough to know. And certainly in our private lives, we'd act, with this much data, about the importance of regulating methane from existing sources.

It's been argued that it's expensive to do something about some of these sources. And I -- as I said in my comments earlier, in environmental regulation, we don't usually look at the expense to an individual, we look at the cost/benefit.

And Verne Loose, who spoke earlier, was modest. He's a Ph.D. in economics who's just retired from Los Alamos and is doing economics there. We usually look at cost/benefit to society. If there are operators who can't afford regulation, then if the costs to society are too high, then they shouldn't be in business. And if it is appropriate for them to get short-term variances and so on, then usually environmental regulation has some way for that to be true.

But you certainly can't run a regulatory system based on a case-by-case determination as to whether or not a particular operator can afford it. Indeed, that would encourage operators who can't afford it to be in business and penalize those who can afford

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

Page 78 Page 80 1 1 represented at the mic. And I wonder, respectfully, to to regulate. 2 2 the man from Artesia whether they have the same vision Another argument that's often made is that the industry is going to leave X, Y or Z. Usually, 3 for their future. 4 4 I realize that industrialization of our regarding environmental regulation in New Mexico, the 5 5 argument is "Well, we won't stay in New Mexico any land and the gas and oil industry has been good for your 6 6 longer. Maybe in this case, we're going to leave BLM generation, but I wonder if that's going to be good for 7 7 the generation going forward, the industrialization of lands in general." 8 But we -- I've heard many of these threats 8 our landscape, whether we need to move to a more 9 9 over the years. And usually, if the oil is valuable balanced landscape, as this gentleman here was saying. 10 10 enough, the gas industry is not likely to leave. It And what that looks like: Do we need to continue on 11 certainly is a good thing to have national regulation in 11 with the ways we live today? 12 this instance, though. 12 I want to read, in keeping with my kind of 13 And I think that would turn me to the 13 moral position, from the Pope, actually. In January, he 14 argument that I've heard most commonly within New 14 offered a comment that I think is very pertinent to this 15 Mexico, and this is the argument on the one hand of 15 issue. "Even if nature is at our disposition, all too 16 16 regulatory duplication. I've never heard industry argue often, we do not respect it or consider it a gracious 17 that EPA should regulate. I'm delighted to hear that, 17 gift which we must care for and (inaudible) the service 18 18 of our brothers and sisters, including future and I'm tempted to turn to it on many occasions. 19 But I would say, for my experience, it's 19 generations. God always forgives, humans sometimes 20 20 quite clear in New Mexico that the state is not going to forgive, but when nature is mistreated, she never 21 regulate. We've actually had state regulations on the 21 forgives." 22 pit rule, with which many people in this room are 22 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. 23 23 familiar, that have been undone. We've had state Any other question, comment? Going one, 24 regulations on groundwater applicable to the mining 24 going twice? Oh, we've got somebody standing up. 25 industry that have been undone. We've had greenhouse 25 Ma'am? Page 79 Page 81 1 gas cap and trade system that has been undone, and of 1 MS. McCALLAN: Norman McCallan here. Sorry 2 course we haven't collected a single fine from the oil 2 for my bad, bad laryngitis. 3 3 and gas industry in three years because of a court case I really appreciate your convening this 4 which has not been overturned or not been remedied by 4 forum today. I think it's been very useful, and 5 the state legislature, leaving an enormous loophole in 5 overdue. And it's not about doing away with oil 6 terms of the industry. 6 production, nobody is suggesting that, it's just doing 7 7 So I would say that regulation by state it better and more efficiently and effectively. 8 government of the oil and gas industry in our state is 8 We're in another year of drought, parched 9 pretty much a cold day in hell. It's not going to 9 fields, dwindling water resources, higher temperatures, 10 happen. We are going to need regulation at a national 10 and no end in sight. I think we've only recently 11 11 realized the huge impact of methane gas on climate level. We need it with respect to fracking fluids, we 12 12 change. And in this issue today, it appears many steps need it with respect to groundwater pollution, with 13 13 can be taken to capture and reduce it, at the profit respect to open pits. 14 14 We're not getting regulation out of the sometimes of the operators themselves. 15 state. We should not be looking to the state for 15 And so I hope that you'll move ahead and 16 work with the EPA as closely as you can and do it with regulation of these areas, and we certainly can't look, 16 17 in this state, for regulation of greenhouse gases at a 17 all deliberate speed. 18 18 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. state level. 19 19 Jesse, Linda, any closing words? Thank you. 20 MR. SPISAK: Thank you. 20 MS. LANCE: Yeah. I just wanted to say 21 MS. AMSTUTZ: I'd like to have a word. 21 thank you so much to you all for giving us so much of 22 22 your time today. And it does occur to me that I knew we Anita Amstutz again, New Mexico Interfaith Power and 23 23 were cutting into your workday, but your comment about Light. 24 24 younger people rarely being able to attend these I notice at these hearings, there's rarely, 25 25 meetings, I wonder if that's -- my colleagues will kill if ever, people from the 20-something generation

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

Page 82 Page 84 1 1 understand why we're so concerned from a health me, but maybe we should do this on a Saturday instead 2 2 standpoint. I can't claim to know much about the health and so that a wider range of ages could be present, and 3 people who have day jobs that they can't leave. 3 impact of being in the oilfield, but I did want to 4 But in any event, I want to thank you, not 4 clarify that what we are talking about is something more 5 only for your time and your thoughtful work on all of 5 at the climactic scale, that when we're looking at 6 this, but for the very civilized tone that everyone had 6 global warming, that what we're seeing is because there 7 today. And there are obviously going to be 7 are seven billion people on planet earth now, and so 8 disagreements on really challenging issues like this, 8 many of us are producers and users that the global 9 9 and I think the way that we reach the best result for impact on climate is of great concern, and that it's 10 10 those of us who try to think through this and apply some started to affect us very deeply locally. 11 rules to the situation, the best result that we can get 11 And so I thought that it was worth 12 12 comes from the willingness of all of you, with your mentioning that, at least from our perspective, that 13 different perspectives, to speak candidly and 13 that's what we're talking about. 14 thoughtfully, and kindly also, and that's how I think we 14 You know, my great grandfather laid some of 15 can work through this. So I appreciate that a lot. I 15 the first natural gas pipelines in the West as part of a 16 know it's not always easy to do, and I do appreciate it. 16 large group, so I would hate to leave here having anyone 17 17 And also, I really appreciate the range of think that, as a society or even as a group of 18 speakers who are willing to stand up and take the 18 environmentalists, that we're not aware or thankful for 19 microphone in a big group like this because I know 19 the resources that we use up to this point. 20 20 that's not always easy either, and it helps us a lot and But as a society, you know, if the baby has 21 it means a lot to all of us. So thanks again. 21 got a fever, we'd better do something about it. And if 22 22 we can figure out how to do that together and come up 23 23 MS. AMSTUTZ: Sorry to jump up again when with solutions that are good for the climate and good 24 24 for the economy and that we can work on together, we're you've already closed, but I wanted to make an 25 25 observation about something that you just said, and that going to be a lot better off.

Page 83

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 85 1

is that this is one of the first public hearings that I've been to in recent memory where there was such an

There's been a tendency lately -- I've been to three BLM hearings in the space of a week and a half where they're doing an open house model. And I understand the benefit of a one-on-one conversation, but from a community standpoint, it's awfully helpful to understand the broad array of perspectives, whether it's from the petroleum industry or from the array of environmental community organizations that might be

An observation that I might have is that, from an agencywide standpoint, that there be a requirement for an open conversation time during the public hearing so that people can learn from one another.

I think, adding to the youthful generation part of the question, that really hearings must be in the evening or on the weekends. We had lots and lots of people saying that they would have loved to be here to learn more but couldn't be.

And then the final thing that I just wanted to clarify for the gentleman whose name I don't remember, I think we may be assuming that people

But the conversation on a national level has gotten so that it's like we're kind of assuming that one another are kind of coming at this from a dishonest standpoint. And I think, from the tone of today's meeting, it's pretty clear that that's not true. And so how can we look for solutions that are going to work for all of us is pretty important, and it seems like this is a good place to start.

Thanks.

MS. LANCE: Thank you. No, that's fine. And just to close, maybe your neighbor, Jesse Juen, might want to say a few words to the people from New Mexico.

MR. JUEN: I'd also like to express my thanks. And I want to highlight something that I think is rather rare, and it gets back to some lawyer talking about that New Mexicans really do get together and have conversations. I've been in many states, been back in D.C., and oftentimes, it's a rhetoric about -- that's going like this. And it's not about having a conversation.

So I thank you for taking time -- your time, your personal time to make sure even though -whether you're representing yourself and it's important to you individually or whether you're representing a

22 (Pages 82 to 85)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Page 86
 1
       group, it's really important. So thank you again for
2
       displaying how community interaction should occur and
3
       why it's so important us to. We really appreciate it.
4
                MS. LANCE: Thank you, everybody.
5
                MR. SPISAK: Thank you all. Have good one.
                   HEARING ADJOURNED.
 7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                                    Page 87
 1
       STATE OF NEW MEXICO )
2
       COUNTY OF SANDOVAL )
3
4
5
               I, ANNE D. WIESE, RPR, CCR, hereby
6
       certify that I reported, to the best of my ability, the
7
       proceedings; that the pages numbered ____ through _
8
       inclusive, are a true and correct transcript of my
9
       stenographic notes and were reduced to typewritten
10
       transcript through computer-aided transcription; that on
       the day I reported these proceedings, I was a New Mexico
11
12
       Certified Court Reporter.
13
               Dated at Placitas, New Mexico, this 22nd
14
       day of May, 2014.
15
16
17
                    ANNE D. WIESE, RPR, CCR
                    New Mexico CCR #301
18
                    Expires: December 31, 2014
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

23 (Pages 86 to 87)

	1	1	1	
A	addressing 51:5	1:13,22	73:16	aquifer 71:25
A-B-E 57:8	76:2	Aldo 53:5	antiquated 14:22	area 2:7 10:4 16:7
Abbe 57:7	adequately 3:23	Alex 58:12	anybody 16:6	18:2 19:8 25:14
ABE 57:7,15	ADJOURNED	Alliance 61:14	66:14 67:10	39:14 40:7 46:14
ability 51:18	86:6	allow 16:14 23:7	anymore 30:22	48:10 53:13 54:2
68:22 87:6	adjusted 14:19	23:13,23 50:8,11	anyway 41:25	63:1 72:11
able 9:6 18:14	administered	allowed 18:12	67:3	areas 8:11,25 9:21
22:8 24:5 26:9	37:14	23:10 28:6	APD's 23:23 69:2	11:4,7 48:25
36:14,24 40:4	administrative	allowing 17:11	appear 64:14	61:24 70:14,24
72:22 81:24	34:4	allows 69:14	appears 81:12	71:12 79:16
absentia 49:8	admissions 14:15	alternatives 13:7	applicable 78:24	argue 78:16
absolutely 16:4	adopted 17:25	Amarillo 5:21	application 20:20	argued 77:6
33:23	advisement 63:9	American 13:19	21:10 23:2	argument 76:7,9
access 70:12	Advisor 3:3 5:18	13:20 50:24 51:9	applied 20:21	76:11,18 78:2,5
accommodate	advocacy 58:14	74:25	apply 82:10	78:14,15
74:12	affect 84:10	Amigos 60:23	appreciate 3:7	arguments 76:1,6
account 74:22	affection 49:12	amount 2:13 4:18	12:19 19:16 47:8	array 83:9,10
Accountability	affiliated 57:10	9:6,8 33:14 37:7	69:22 73:18 81:3	Artesia 15:12
6:22 53:14 60:5	afford 77:15,23,24	47:25 57:19	82:15,16,17 86:3	32:10 67:12,15
accounting 75:2	77:25	61:23 63:4 69:14	appreciative	80:2
accounts 64:6	afternoon 21:22	amounts 38:3	52:19	articulated 69:15
accrued 10:19	50:15 59:15	Amstutz 46:23,23	approach 24:12	artificial 67:11
acknowledge	agencies 33:20	79:21,22 82:23	25:8	artists 70:12
75:12	46:12 56:10,11	analyses 12:25	appropriate 4:18	aside 71:12
act 43:3 45:10	61:4	analysis 13:4,5	20:15 24:17 51:2	asking 49:13
77:4	agency 13:1 41:8	20:16,17 21:15	65:12 77:17	54:11
action 22:23,25	agencywide 83:14	21:17 22:16,18	appropriately	assess 48:10
63:18,21 65:23	agendas 55:14	27:5 32:19 36:23	31:21	assessment 4:25
68:17	ages 82:2	65:2,3,7,13,19	appropriateness	59:20
actions 41:8 75:22	aggravation 68:9	65:20,21 66:3	65:9	associated 8:23,24
activities 10:14	aggregate 69:10	analyzing 27:2	approval 20:10	9:14,15 16:15
52:10,10	aggregating 69:3	ancillary 4:21	23:10 24:3 63:7	17:9 20:3
add 44:15	ago 48:11 51:24	anglers 53:7	69:2	Association 21:24
added 21:18	53:5 65:19	angling 53:7,20	approvals 21:11	22:5 27:11 29:21
adding 25:17	agree 31:16	Anita 46:23 79:22	21:13	37:22 51:15
83:18	ahead 81:15	ANNE 1:19 87:5	approve 21:10	assuming 83:25
addition 74:7	air 7:4 42:22 43:3	87:17	23:22	85:2
additional 32:12	43:6,10,16,18	announcement	approved 21:10	assurance 44:6
44:12 58:4	45:9 47:19 48:10	33:16	23:14	assurances 62:4
additions 14:2	48:22 49:16,23	annually 39:10,11	approximately	assure 44:4
address 9:19	50:5 63:25 64:1	53:16	47:22	atmosphere 17:11
45:20 52:20 55:7	64:9 65:25 66:12	answer 61:20,23	approximation	17:23 18:4,13
59:24 63:20	70:23 71:4	68:4 69:4,23	48:7	47:15 60:15 74:2
addressed 31:21	Alamos 77:13	73:9	April 5:25 30:4	74:13 75:4
42:8	ALBUQUERQ	anticipate 58:4	41:4 44:22	attempt 17:17
12.0		_		

				1496 07
attend 81:24	bat 3:11	26:24 27:24	built 36:10 51:23	cases 23:16 37:2
attention 5:1	BCF 8:19	28:17,22 32:13	52:3 69:13	65:14
attitude 2:14	BCF's 8:18	33:1 39:3 42:16	bunch 3:17	casinghead 9:15
attorney 21:23	bearing 28:20	43:3,10 54:11,22	bundling 6:7	20:3,10 23:22
22:4	beautiful 70:15	55:12 57:8 58:1	burden 24:21,21	catchall 32:3
audience 43:4	becoming 58:22	58:18 60:2,6,8	Bureau 1:8 2:6	caught 34:11
August 51:14	beginning 18:9	60:23 61:2,18,25	buses 67:12	cause 17:21 48:22
authorities 7:6,7	behalf 27:10 29:20	62:5 63:20 64:8	business 13:16	caused 44:25
19:23 43:12	37:21 46:24	65:6 68:22 76:2	22:17 77:17,25	causing 28:3
authority 19:10	59:17	78:6 83:5	22.17 77.17,23	65:24 71:25 72:1
25:12 42:17	believe 42:16 45:8	BLM's 12:22	$\overline{\mathbf{C}}$	CCR 1:19 87:5,17
authorize 46:7	51:14 60:16	42:18,25 61:19	calculation 7:8	87:18
authorized 13:15	71:20 72:25	62:4 68:7	calculations 37:11	Center 11:21
14:2,4 16:12	bending 54:15	BLM-managed	called 41:19,20	18:20 25:2 68:3
27:13 28:20	beneficial 12:6	60:11	50:16 64:19	73:20
authorizing 68:17	26:14	blow 18:4,12	72:15	centuries 71:14
available 14:20	benefit 4:21 23:2	blowing 29:13	cameras 39:23	certain 9:5,6 18:8
15:4 16:22 71:2	42:12 43:16	board 2:12	61:18 62:17,20	21:7 23:23 30:7
83:12	74:25 83:7	boardrooms 47:11	Camille 32:22	37:7,9 57:1
avoid 15:25 56:11	Berry 49:4		Camping 54:8	69:14 71:12
	•	bog 32:15	70:1	
avoidable 13:12	best 8:9 13:2	boomers 49:6,6,8	candidly 82:13	certainly 7:2 8:7
13:24 42:19	16:22 53:12 82:9	borders 73:3	Canyon 52:7	9:7,10,11 15:8
aware 12:15 19:3	82:11 87:6	bore 17:11,23	cap 79:1	26:24 29:12
45:25 84:18	better 14:23 26:10	borne 48:22	cap 79.1 capacity 16:9	33:15 39:18
awfully 83:8	29:10 31:9 35:3	bottleneck 28:4	19:13,20 73:4	43:22 77:3,21
В	58:7 81:7 84:21	boundaries 34:4	capped 29:14	78:11 79:16
baby 84:20	84:25	boundary 19:24	capped 29.14 capture 18:24	Certified 87:12
back 5:25 6:18	beyond 33:8	Boyd 75:8,8	19:5 24:16 28:24	certify 87:6
8:14 10:2 38:9	big 31:22 39:24	brain 45:1		Chaco 51:7,15,21
	53:11 71:23 72:2	Bravos 60:23	35:8,10 58:7 64:13 68:5 81:13	51:23
53:24 61:15	72:12 82:19	breach 50:9		chair 66:23
66:12 85:16,18	bigger 62:22	break 10:8 11:9	captured 19:7,14	challenging 82:8
bad 81:2,2	biggest 8:25	36:23	72:23	chance 59:25
bag 54:24	billing 8:19,20	breaking 6:14	capturing 11:6	change 47:4,24
bail 40:3	35:24	breakout 8:13	35:5 74:20	59:20 60:1 61:6
Bakken 57:21	billion 84:7	bright 52:10	car 66:22	63:20 64:11 66:1
balance 70:7,9	Bingaman 2:16	bring 4:18 46:25	carbon 49:15 64:3	72:1 75:17 81:12
balanced 80:9	bit 7:6,11 21:4	60:18	care 49:21 80:17	changed 6:20 67:4
based 6:21 24:13	36:3 39:8 45:1	bringing 49:2	careful 15:17	changes 6:20
28:7 39:9 45:18	76:19	brings 20:18	carefully 65:6,13	21:16
77:22	bleed 36:15 37:6	broad 83:9	carried 21:20	changing 63:8
basically 7:17	BLM 3:12 10:5	broader 25:13,14	case 76:9 78:6	Chapter 24:11
10:3 20:16 23:15	12:2,6 13:22,25	brothers 80:18	79:3	32:23 64:25
basis 27:2 39:5	15:14 17:12 19:8	bucket 10:17,17	case-by-case	charging 13:19
57:18	20:9,11 22:25,25	build 18:4 69:17	77:22	14:2
			l	

				Page 90
chart 8:12 14:14	alothos 66:21 22	24:15 32:7,12,20	compounds 20.1	conserving 64:14
14:17 15:3,8	clothes 66:21,22 Club 24:11 26:4	37:20 41:22 42:1	compounds 29:1 comprehensive	consider 8:8 9:22
check 62:6	63:14 64:25 75:9	44:2 46:11 59:11	61:5,9 65:20,21	9:23 11:8 13:22
	75:10		66:3	
Cherry 50:16 child 67:9	75:10 Club's 64:17	65:17 80:14,23 81:23		21:11 36:11 43:25 50:1 54:4
children 48:23	coal 72:2,4		compressions 7:16	56:4 65:6 80:16
chloride 48:23	coal 72:2,4 coal-burning	comments 5:6,9 6:13 10:2,8	compressor 19:12 25:22	50:4 05:0 80:10 considerable
Chris 55:18	76:15	11:10,22 15:9	compressors 9:1	33:14
chronically 53:21	coal-fired 47:25	17:5 18:17 20:1	45:21,23	considered 35:25
churches 47:2	76:15	21:21 22:21 24:7	compromise 54:12	40:16,20,22,23
citizen 54:14	cold 79:9	27:8 29:16 35:15	55:1	54:19 65:13,16
citizenry 47:19	colleague 71:1	38:23 40:9 42:24	computer-aided	considering 6:25
citizens 47:19	colleagues 81:25	44:15,21 45:14	87:10	13:7 21:5 25:3
50:5 61:14	collected 23:18	55:6 62:3 63:14	concentrations	36:16 46:4
civilized 82:6	79:2	65:5,8 77:8	48:20	considers 20:11
claim 84:2	college 66:11 67:9	commission 15:6	concern 3:10 5:1	consistency's 33:4
claim 64.2 clarification 18:17	Colorado 17:24	58:6	22:7 29:12 72:17	consistency \$ 33.4 consistent 30:23
clarifications 10:9	39:13 41:3 48:4	commit 62:10	75:23 84:9	31:10 34:5
24:7 37:20 40:9	48:10 56:4,6,8	commitment 23:6	concerned 24:12	constituents 64:2
clarified 5:7	69:8	68:18	54:1 57:19 58:23	constitutes 20:15
clarify 83:24 84:4	combust 35:6,13	common 54:14	59:2,4 76:25,25	constraints 16:21
classmates 66:14	combusted 21:7	74:5,11	84:1	construction 23:8
clean 43:3 50:5	71:4	commonly 78:14	concerning 30:9	27:13,14,15,16
54:25 70:13	combusters 29:6	commonsense	32:5 44:21 45:15	27:19,22 43:1
cleaned 16:2	combusting 11:6	17:3 63:24 70:21	concerns 3:24	contaminating
cleaner 71:10	34:24,25	communities 47:1	11:10 16:10	71:24
clear 13:12 23:11	combustion 21:5	70:10,19	21:21 32:1,2	context 12:17 13:6
58:22 69:16	28:23 34:18,21	community 24:22	45:25 53:10	13:6 25:4
78:20 85:5	35:3,6	67:17 71:18 74:6	57:17 71:23	continue 4:3 6:16
clearer 20:23	come 2:11 7:13	83:8,11 86:2	concluded 60:5	56:9,20 58:3
clearly 23:16	11:13 12:13	companies 22:13	conclusions 7:21	61:9 71:13 80:10
43:12 44:10	14:10 27:24 30:3	27:24 56:21 58:3	45:19	continuing 15:6
climactic 84:5	34:5 36:22 40:19	64:15 71:6,7	condition 24:3	contribute 64:10
climate 4:24 47:3	43:22 56:13	company 20:17	conditional 69:1	contribute 04.10
47:24 59:20,25	58:17 62:7 66:16	55:19	conditionally	controller 36:17
61:6 63:17,18,20	67:15 69:11,20	compared 31:24	23:22	controlling 25:25
64:11,17 66:1	84:22	complete 9:20	conditions 21:16	26:16
72:1 75:17,17	comes 2:25 18:14	completely 16:2	24:14	controls 48:5
81:11 84:9,23	38:9 40:15 45:9	27:4 54:21	connected 20:8	convening 81:3
clockwise 8:16	54:20 82:12	completion 10:15	consequences	Conventional
close 48:6 85:11	coming 2:3 3:5	10:20 16:16,19	19:18	5:18
closed 82:24	15:7 39:22 40:1	33:13 56:18	conservation 9:16	conversation 5:9
closely 81:16	55:4 68:11 85:3	completions 7:15	21:9 22:22 23:12	8:3 43:21 47:1
closing 64:16	comment 6:2 9:25	8:23 9:13 10:11	23:14 25:4,13,16	57:4 83:7,15
81:19	13:11 15:3 18:22	10:23 11:4 14:3	43:13,15 53:4	85:1,21
01.17	13.11 13.3 10.22	10.23 11. 7 17.3	13.13,13 33.7	00.1,21
	•	•		•

				Page 91
conversations	63:21,23 74:16	30:7 55:8	designed 8:4 13:7	46:25 49:3 82:13
45:5 70:6 85:18	75:5,23	dated 8:12,14	48:9	difficult 22:15,19
Conversely 51:25	cubic 8:19,20	87:13	desire 49:7	38:18 69:11
convey 46:3 75:16	16:13 36:25 37:1	dates 6:18	despite 47:15	dioxide 64:3
cook 73:23	39:11	day 79:9 82:3	destroyed 49:16	directed 60:25
coordinating 33:2	cultural 51:7,10	87:11,14	destruction 75:17	direction 27:7
Corners 53:13	70:11,11	days 16:13	details 3:4	director 2:6,10
55:20	culture 54:18	deadline 62:4	detection 9:17	21:23 22:4 32:23
correct 63:7 87:8	cumulative 17:14	deadlines 33:15	38:25 39:3 40:7	53:2 58:13
cost 13:15 14:1	18:15	deal 10:7 16:18	40:8 61:17	disagreements
36:16,17 37:12	curanderas 70:12	18:14 30:5 34:6	deterioration	82:8
38:13,16 60:17	curb 33:2 64:9	40:21	65:25	discount 21:2
60:18,20 65:22	Curbing 63:18	December 87:18	determination	discretion 69:14
75:3	current 7:18 10:5	decent 31:21	77:22	discussion 23:25
cost-effective 37:3	10:18,21 17:12	decide 38:12	determinations	34:1 43:9,19
64:12	20:9 28:17 35:24	decision 12:17	22:17	58:20 74:19
cost/benefit 77:10	63:6	21:20	determine 16:9	discussions 6:8
77:14	currently 16:12	decisionmaking	68:15	9:9,21 46:14
costly 18:8	22:25 60:10	12:23 13:9 18:23	determining	dishonest 85:3
costs 56:16 77:15	Curtis 58:12,13	decisions 12:1,25	10:13	displaying 86:2
counsel 2:15	curve 12:12	declaring 75:22	develop 25:23	disposition 80:15
Counselor 61:24	cutting 81:23	deeply 84:10	developed 8:10	disruption 64:18
63:3	cutting 01.23	deer 53:12,12	11:1 14:17 24:18	distant 7:19
country 47:2,12	D	define 27:17 74:11	developers 71:8	distinction 13:23
50:5 51:19 53:22	D 1:19 87:5,17	defined 20:4	developing 71:7	diversify 53:9
54:21 67:23	D.C 2:10 4:2 6:10	22:23 39:1	development	divide 43:17
County 48:3,6	85:19	defines 28:16	25:21,25 26:1,10	DJ 55:18
87:2	daily 57:18	defining 10:5	26:11,17 27:6	docket 42:6
couple 20:25 42:3	Dakota 4:1 51:3	definition 23:17	48:23,24 70:18	DOE 33:3,18
62:3 65:5,18	51:25 52:4 57:10	68:23	71:7,12	doing 3:20 6:7 7:1
course 7:7 10:11	58:5	degrade 26:6	developmental	7:24,25 13:16
27:1 35:9 67:2	damage 45:1	degree 33:16 55:2	27:1	18:22 22:18 24:5
68:16 79:2	65:24	delay 28:1	devices 7:14 8:24	31:11 33:19,21
court 1:20 11:11	damaged 67:5	deliberate 81:17	9:17 35:16,20,23	37:23 38:5,7
76:12 79:3 87:12	Dan 15:11 32:9	delighted 78:17	35:25 36:3,4,5	41:13 46:8 48:8
cover 11:3	34:17 66:7,8	Denise 24:10 26:4	36:12 37:18,19	52:20 56:3,5
covered 28:22	dangerous 64:9	26:4 75:8	38:16,19	58:7 60:15 65:12
37:19	72:21		<i>'</i>	69:9 76:20 77:13
	dangers 75:20	Denver 6:15 55:16	Devon 14:12 41:19	
covering 9:13	Dark 51:14,16	Department 54:23		81:5,6 83:6
covers 7:14 create 67:24 70:23	Darren 14:12	56:6	dialogue 8:5 57:9	dollars 50:10 53:8
	41:18	depending 20:7	Dickinson 6:9	53:16,20
created 67:23	data 9:9 14:20,22	37:11 38:3	different 5:5 6:20	donated 67:12
creature 5:23	76:19 77:2,2,4	Deputy 2:10	7:6 10:3 16:20	donkey 30:12
criterias 21:2	date 17:21 23:2	desecration 47:18	25:5 34:6 38:2,3	door 25:24
critical 63:17,19	uatt 17.21 23.2	design 6:14 69:18	39:12 41:13 45:9	dovetail 33:22
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				rage 32
dovetails 33:17	23:16 24:14,16	63:1,10	ensure 18:23 19:6	essentially 4:16
downstream 19:2	26:6,10 32:19	either 20:5 38:6	19:10,13,20 21:9	13:20
19:6,13,19	39:17 47:16	82:20	70:9,19 71:11	establish 10:12
drafted 3:18	57:25 60:16,17	electric 35:19,20	ensuring 21:14,18	20:23 42:25
dramatically	65:15,20,23 75:4	eliminate 23:1	74:13,14	establishing 42:18
65:10	economically	60:9	entity 65:12	52:7
draw 8:2	47:17 60:9	eliminates 22:23	environment 56:6	establishment
drill 26:8	economics 20:12	emerge 44:9,9	65:22,24	18:15
drilled 70:24	21:19 22:9,15	emission 8:13	environmental	estimate 76:14
drilling 12:1 48:13	37:23 38:11,17	28:25 40:15	11:21 18:20	estimated 60:8
48:17 50:9 60:10	65:2,3,10,17	emission-type 7:5	24:19 25:2 49:5	etcetera 2:24
70:18	66:4 74:20,21,22	emissions 8:22,25	52:5 68:3 73:20	44:16 61:4
driven 74:21	75:2,2 77:12,13	9:8,16 13:4,5	74:6 76:10,20	ethic 52:5
drop 30:21	economies 53:9	14:24 17:9 28:15	77:8,19 78:4	ethicist 49:5
drought 53:10	economy 67:24	29:6,17 33:2,9	83:11	evaluations 38:15
81:8	84:24	38:21 40:18	environmentalists	evening 83:20
drying 75:20	economywide	43:10 47:25 49:1	84:18	event 6:9 17:22
due 10:23	75:1	49:15 63:19 64:1	environmentally	82:4
duplicate 7:10	edification 40:14	64:6,10 76:14,24	52:14	events 15:18
29:2	education 59:6	emphasize 58:25	EPA 4:10 7:2,13	17:13 55:11
duplication 55:22	effect 12:7 13:19	73:21	10:24 11:3 14:18	eventual 44:1
56:12 78:16	14:18 24:13,20	employer 67:8	15:16 28:23	everybody 75:18
duration 17:14,21	26:14 30:3 41:4	empty 66:22	31:10 33:3,18	86:4
18:15	60:15 76:23	72:13	36:3,4 37:19	evolve 44:8
dwindling 81:9	effective 4:22	enable 71:6	42:4,8,16 43:10	exactly 35:1
	effectively 81:7	encourage 13:25	44:4,11,22,22	example 9:3 13:14
<u>E</u>	effectiveness	18:25 19:15	45:5,15,25 50:2	14:3 19:9 25:12
e-mail 9:25 55:6	62:19	25:10 42:5,8	56:2,7 76:2,9	26:15 45:19
earlier 15:6 33:21	effects 26:14 61:6	46:10 52:12 55:1	77:1 78:17 81:16	53:19 56:25 57:2
38:10 41:19	66:1	56:2,4,9,20 57:3	EPA's 42:21 45:9	67:13
44:24 62:24 71:1	efficiencies 25:19	60:23 61:9 64:17	74:10	exceed 16:14
77:8,11	43:1	64:20 65:6 77:24	equal 47:24 76:15	excel 39:24,25
early 3:20	efficiency 21:5	encouraging	equation 20:25	excellent 54:24
earth 59:17 84:7	34:25 35:3 58:23	59:10	36:13	exceptions 16:15
earthquakes	59:2,3	Energy 5:18 14:13	equipment 18:5,7	36:8,10
71:25	efficient 4:22	15:11 32:9 34:17	18:10,13 35:17	excess 40:18
easily 12:14	11:18	41:19 55:12	36:8,14,15,16,25	exclusive 4:8
eastern 73:2	efficiently 81:7	72:24	37:5	excuse 8:17 16:11
easy 82:16,20	effort 14:22,23	enforce 55:2	Eric 75:24	28:22
echo 18:21 54:9	33:25 51:6 62:18	enforced 12:10,14	Erik 11:20 18:19	executive 21:23
55:21	efforts 9:5,10 33:2	enforcement 41:8	25:1 73:14,19	22:4 53:2
echoing 26:3	33:22 63:19	enjoy 51:21	error 35:21	existing 8:8 12:3,7
economic 20:15	eight 9:12	Enjoying 54:8	especially 18:2	12:22 25:11,15
20:23 21:3,9,15	EIS's 27:1	70:1	45:16 53:11,11	29:5 30:8,14,24
22:16,18 23:12	Eisenfeld 61:13,13	enormous 79:5	59:3,22	31:1 36:12,15
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

				1496 75
37:5,18 70:21	fall 43:13	fields 11:2 23:21	fluids 79:11	four-state 2:7
77:1,5	familiar 39:23	81:9	focus 9:7 26:5	fracking 79:11
expand 11:4 30:14	62:14 78:23	figure 30:11,13	62:23	fractured 11:1,5
32:4	familiarity 12:2	71:10 84:22	focusing 68:6	fracturing 7:15
expansion 30:8	family 51:20	fill 55:24	folks 43:21 44:2	33:5,11,25 34:9
expect 6:12 17:3	far 27:20 33:18	final 31:14 83:23	55:22 66:19 69:8	48:8,14,18 56:22
22:11	51:1,8 54:3 63:8	finalizing 33:5	follow 59:23	62:9 72:15
expected 24:2	farmer 49:4	Finally 31:4,17	following 68:8	fragmented 53:22
75:14	Farmington 61:14	find 9:22 51:1	football 67:11,12	frame 62:7 66:23
expense 77:9	61:18 62:16 63:2	71:9 74:5	Force 66:12	framing 11:23
expensive 77:6	Farmington-spe	fine 6:14 43:17	forecast 68:10	frankly 30:10
experience 2:13	62:15	79:2 85:10	forget 15:13	free 70:13 71:12
2:25 78:19	fascinating 73:24	fire 75:20	forgive 80:20	freshen 6:24
experiences 2:23	fashion 39:6	first 10:10 11:22	forgives 80:19,21	Friday 6:9 55:8
_				•
52:4 Evnivos 97:19	fast-acting 36:9	14:10,10 17:17	formal 44:2	57:14
Expires 87:18	faults 49:18	17:24 30:3 42:1	format 10:3	front 18:5,12
explain 43:4	faulty 45:19	50:8 51:7 58:17	Formation 64:20	fruit 73:25
exploit 74:23	favorite 2:20	62:6 83:1 84:15	formula 36:22	frustration 54:10
exploratory 48:9	feasible 60:13	fish 53:25	38:7	fuel 25:14 27:6
exposed 48:25	features 64:18	fit 41:24	formulate 62:1	full 27:1
express 85:14	federal 7:9 8:8,15	five 4:15 7:13	formulated 52:5	fully 14:18
Extend 16:18	28:8 50:19,25	44:22	Fort 24:10,10 26:4	funding 59:6
extension 27:22	56:10 67:18	fix 39:20 62:23	forum 51:1 58:18	further 36:23
28:8	74:17,23	fixed 21:12,14	58:19 73:17 81:4	55:10
extensions 23:10	Federation 53:3	fixing 23:15	83:3	future 32:11 54:4
28:6 58:2	feedback 9:10,23	flare 13:14 15:15	forward 6:23 9:10	80:3,18
extent 14:24 27:3	62:21 69:7	21:10,11 35:12	11:2,3 15:7 18:2	fuzzy 42:15
27:4	feel 43:5 47:10	flared 4:16 10:20	34:8 43:9 44:1	G
extraction 26:11	57:24 75:16 76:1	20:7 21:6 47:22	44:10 49:22 54:3	
extractive 60:18	feeling 75:19,20	57:1	54:19 58:6 70:17	game 53:11,25
extremely 30:15	feet 8:19,20 16:13	flaring 3:16 6:4,18	77:1 80:7	GAO 4:14 60:8
	36:25 37:1 39:12	11:6 13:15 14:4	Foster 21:22,23	Garfield 48:3,6
F	Feibelman 32:22	14:5 16:12 20:10	22:2,3 27:10,10	Garrett 53:1
facilitate 26:10	32:22	21:11 22:24 23:1	27:21 28:12	Garrett's 54:9
60:6	fever 84:21	23:7,10,13 27:13	29:19,20 30:1	gas 3:3 4:15,20,24
facilities 39:10	field 12:2,12,15	27:23 34:9,23	31:7,12,15 37:21	7:16 8:22 9:1,15
61:20	20:16 22:13	47:8 52:9 53:16	37:21 40:11,22	9:15 10:19 11:1
facility 39:6,7	24:17,21 25:23	57:19,22,25	41:2,6,16 44:17	11:5 13:5,17,18
facing 57:18	27:1 63:2 67:11	61:16,23 63:4	44:20,25 46:19	14:20 16:8,21
fact 12:3 24:4	68:11	65:4,22 66:4	46:22	18:24 19:7,14
57:23 74:3,22	field-level 25:20	68:17 73:17	found 48:11 51:11	20:4,10,12 21:5
factor 66:2	field-wide 20:13	flexibility 69:13	53:15	21:6,8 22:22,24
fair 26:22	21:3 22:9,15	floor 66:20	four 6:7 17:24	23:1,12,14,22
fairly 17:2 39:18	field-wide-type	flow 16:9 40:4	30:21 51:16	24:16 25:4,13,16
faith 47:1	25:8	flowing 16:10	53:13 55:19	26:7,12 28:16,24

				rage 94
34:18,22 35:3,8	getting 15:17	78:20 79:9,10	78:24 79:12	83:5,19
35:18,23,24	32:14 46:5 49:9	80:6,7,23,24	group 60:23 61:3	hearten 75:23
36:18 38:1,2,3,5	65:9 79:14	82:7 84:25 85:6	74:6 82:19 84:16	heat 70:4
38:15 40:1 42:19	gift 80:17	85:20	84:17 86:1	HECHO 54:8
47:20,21 50:8	Girand 15:11,11	good 4:22 9:7	growth 63:22	69:25 70:8
54:15,21 55:11	32:9,9 34:15,17	21:22 27:17	guess 14:15 42:17	held 74:18
55:12 56:18,25	34:17,21 35:5,14	31:13 33:10	guidance 20:15	helium 5:21
60:7,10,10 63:22	66:8,8	46:13,14 49:9	guys 2:15 29:19	hell 79:9
64:2,3,5,9,15	Girand's 73:22	50:15 59:13,15	46:17,17 50:22	help 5:13 9:4,9
66:24 67:7 68:5	give 28:9 31:21	62:21 67:20		12:11 26:18
68:23 70:18 71:3	44:6 45:22 53:25	78:11 80:5,6	Н	35:13 61:5 71:8
71:23 72:4,6,9	given 12:3 14:19	84:23,23 85:8	habitat 53:18	71:9,20
72:21 73:6,17,22	63:22 68:20,20	86:5	54:25	helpful 43:6 46:16
73:24 74:7,14,18	giving 61:7 81:21	gotten 26:25 27:3	half 83:5	83:8
74:20,23 76:14	global 84:6,8	85:2	hand 49:11 78:15	helping 26:17
78:10 79:1,3,8	go 5:7 7:11 8:1,7	govern 7:4	handing 46:8	helps 53:9 82:20
80:5 81:11 84:15	11:3,14 22:3	government 2:23	hands 75:11	Henny 16:3
gases 20:3 56:23	23:12 27:20 29:4	28:8 50:25 53:14	happen 14:5	herds 53:11,12,12
58:8 59:22 76:16	31:2 39:13,18	60:4 67:19 71:9	79:10	53:25 70:14
79:17	43:20 44:1 49:8	79:8	happening 17:4	Hey 3:5 12:7
gather 31:8 44:12	51:25 52:16	governs 6:17	happens 70:5	Hi 14:12 24:10
gathering 19:11	53:17 55:17	grace 23:24	72:12	41:18 53:1 57:7
20:8 23:6 25:22	61:15 62:5 70:24	grace 25:24 gracious 80:16	hard 33:15 43:14	58:12 63:13
		Grand 52:7	43:17	71:17 73:14
68:15,18 69:4	76:13,23		harming 64:1	
gears 21:4	goals 34:7 69:16 God 80:19	Grande 24:11 32:23 64:25	harmonize 42:3	high 38:6 47:14 48:25 66:15 67:9
general 6:22,22			hate 84:16	
7:20 9:5 11:23 11:24 20:19	goes 5:4 25:10 26:3	grandfather 49:17	he'll 5:4	77:16
		84:14	head 37:8,15	higher 26:9 29:7
24:19 33:1,3	going 3:1,9 4:1,6	granted 58:3	health 14:6 26:20	33:16 36:9 48:20
34:12 69:15 78:7	9:10,12 17:19	granting 28:2	50:10 56:6 60:21	57:23 60:13 81:9
generally 7:4,7	18:2 23:20,21	great 2:13,18 3:6	63:25 84:1,2	highest 48:12
16:8 19:23 25:6	25:23 27:7 28:5	32:12 46:19	healthier 70:23	50:12
35:18,22 75:15	30:15,23 31:11	50:20 84:9,14	healthy 70:14,15	highlight 85:15
generate 28:19	32:12,16,16,19	greater 28:25,25	hear 3:21 22:2	Hispanics 54:8
generates 53:8,19	33:25 34:8 36:25	29:7	29:15 32:11	70:1
generation 49:18	38:6,7,11,17,17	greatest 74:25	37:16 56:2 57:18	Historical 51:8
79:25 80:6,7	41:7,8 42:4 43:9	greed 49:6	76:21 78:17	52:1
83:18	43:22,24,25 45:3	greenhouse 4:24	heard 56:1 57:12	historically 18:2
generations 49:14	45:14,24 46:25	13:5 14:20 47:20	66:17 78:8,14,16	history 42:11
49:22 80:19	47:15,17 49:21	64:2 76:16 78:25	hearing 55:22	70:15
gentleman 80:9	49:22,22 50:11	79:17	O	Hobbs 66:15
83:24	57:15,20,23 58:6	grew 66:10	73:16 75:14	hold 30:11
geographic 65:7,9	59:23 61:5,24,25	ground 72:13 74:5	83:16 86:6	holding 51:2
geologist 72:19	69:6,12 71:22	74:12	hearings 59:23	58:18 72:17
George 57:7	74:2 77:1 78:3,6	groundwater	63:15 79:24 83:1	holistic 60:17
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

		ī		
home 73:24	illustrated 15:5	incorporating	35:11 68:15,19	inventory 8:21
homes 48:8 70:4	immense 61:23	13:8	69:2,5	14:20 47:21
Honorable 60:25	impact 81:11 84:3	increase 48:13	inhabit 54:2	invite 67:15
hope 3:13 4:5 5:10	84:9	increased 63:3	initial 4:9 16:11	involved 74:20
28:4 30:22 45:12	impacted 53:21	incredible 51:10	48:13	IQ 48:24
71:19 81:15	impacts 27:5	incur 16:15	injection 11:6	issue 3:13,16 4:12
hopefully 20:6	imperative 13:10	independent	input 46:6	4:13 12:6 14:6,6
hoping 61:2	imperfect 12:8	21:24 22:4,7	inspection 39:9	22:10 30:2 31:23
horizon 64:4	implementation	27:11,23 29:20	61:20	40:12 52:20
hour 37:1,1	41:10	37:22 38:11,14	Inspector 6:22	60:16,17 63:21
hours 16:14 17:13	implemented	48:2 55:19,23	install 18:10 23:6	72:3 73:25 75:4
house 59:19 66:22	12:10,14 41:4,7	67:7	68:18	80:15 81:12
83:6	62:5 72:7 73:5	indirect 26:14	installation 29:5	issues 2:15 3:17
huge 31:22 66:24	implementing	individual 68:6	installations 7:5	3:17,23 4:8 5:22
66:24 81:11	23:4	77:10	installed 10:14	11:23 28:10
human-induced	implications	individually 85:25	30:7	31:20 46:18 47:4
59:21	71:24	Industrial 58:5	instance 15:15	51:5,5 59:21
humans 80:19	importance 76:16	industrialization	16:19 17:14	82:8
hunters 53:6	77:5	80:4,7	22:14 36:12,13	item 62:13
hunting 52:15	important 5:12	industries 60:19	78:12	1tcm 02.13
53:7 54:8 70:1	12:22 70:10	industry 8:9 14:16	instances 19:3	J
hydraulic 7:15	76:11,13 85:7,24	14:25 32:13	26:5	January 60:24
33:5,11,25 34:9	86:1,3	42:10 44:5 46:1	instrument 35:21	80:13
48:8,17 56:22	importantly 56:11	47:6,21 50:4	insulation 36:17	Jesse 2:5 5:16,21
62:9	imposing 42:20	53:7 54:11,13,15	integrate 61:3,3	81:19 85:11
hydraulically 11:1	improbable 32:17	56:15 64:12 74:8	integrate 01.3,3	Jewell 60:25
11:5	improves 56:22	76:3 78:3,10,16	intended 9.20 intent 7:10 42:3	job 4:17,22 40:25
· =	inadequate 76:19	78:25 79:3,6,8	intent 7.10 42.3	58:7
hydrocarbons 48:12	inaudible 27:5	80:5 83:10	interaction 86:2	jobs 82:3
48:12				Juan 53:19 61:14
T	30:19 35:21	inevitably 12:13	interest 56:17	Juen 2:2,5,20,22
idea 18:1 24:6	37:24 40:16	influence 33:6	65:15	85:11,14
27:19	44:15 59:5 63:23	,	interested 8:5	jump 82:23
ideas 8:2 9:19	64:19 66:17	informal 22:16	71:21	June 63:16
10:3,6,22 16:19	67:14 68:11 69:5	information 9:3	interests 74:12	jurisdiction 42:15
17:16,18 20:19	69:23 80:17	20:17 22:12	Interfaith 46:24	43:5 45:8
20:23 21:1 37:15	includes 55:13	44:12 45:22	79:22	justify 35:11
37:17 39:13	including 2:7	55:10,13	Intergovernme	justify 33.11
43:22 44:8	80:18	informed 14:23	47:24	K
identified 3:23	inclusive 87:8	infrared 39:23	interim 61:25 63:4	Kansas 2:7
4:15	inconvenience	61:18 62:17,20	Interior 54:23	Karin 21:23 22:3
identify 9:21 39:1	47:16	62:25	internalize 14:1	27:10 29:19
identifying 39:25	inconvenient 47:5	infrastructure	internally 43:21	37:21
62:21	47:18 50:3	18:5,23 19:5,6	International	keep 38:12 74:2
ignorance 50:7	incorporated	19:11,12,17 23:7	51:14,15 52:11	keeping 74:3
ignorance 50.7	55:19 66:2	23:13 24:2 26:13	introduce 2:9	-F8 · ····
	l		l	

				Page 30
80:12	knows 12:5	62:21,23	6:6 81:19	85:6
Kentucky 49:4		learn 41:10 83:16	line 20:8 25:22	looked 21:17 27:5
kept 71:12	L	83:22	33:4 42:15 43:17	37:7
kick 6:4	lady 2:12	learned 33:24	50:2 56:16,18,25	looking 9:18 10:1
kidding 73:11	lady's 44:21	41:15	lines 17:17 19:12	11:25 20:19 37:5
kill 81:25	laid 84:14	learning 12:12	29:8 40:7	37:11 41:12 44:4
kind 3:1,3,11 6:24	Lance 2:11,18,21	lease 12:25 19:24	links 55:15	46:20 62:19 67:3
7:17,24,25 14:1	3:5 21:25 29:25	27:20 28:17	liquid 7:14 9:14	69:19 70:6,7
14:17,22 15:4	44:3 46:2 50:21	35:17,22,25 39:2	17:10	79:15 84:5
21:5 22:9 27:3,6	81:20 85:10 86:4	68:6	liquids 17:7,12,18	looks 67:16 80:10
27:14 28:16 29:9	land 1:8 2:6 49:21	leasehold 20:11	list 4:8 9:20	loophole 79:5
31:22 32:3 33:17	50:9 53:25 54:18	leaseholder 65:15	little 7:6,11 8:12	Loose 64:24,24
33:21 34:1 37:1	60:11 70:11,21	leases 8:15	11:18 20:14 21:4	77:11
39:5 40:4 42:18	80:5	leasing 12:25	36:3 39:8 45:1	loosening 72:16
42:22 43:3 45:6	lands 7:9 50:17	25:16,17	76:18	Lopez 55:18,18
46:8 50:1 52:16	52:19 60:4 70:15	leave 49:10,23	live 49:12,19,21	Los 77:13
67:4 80:12 85:2	74:15 78:7	78:3,6,10 82:3	49:22 67:8,14	lose 15:22 35:6
85:3	landscape 26:13	84:16	70:24 80:11	loses 53:15
kindly 82:14	26:19 80:8,9	leaving 79:5	lived 51:23 66:9	losing 15:24 51:19
kinds 47:6,11	landscapes 70:15	led 52:5	67:1	loss 15:22 39:2
48:25 52:13 61:1	70:16	left 54:25	lives 75:18 77:4	42:19 47:13
70:25	large 27:3,4 31:23	legal 43:20	LiveStreamed 4:3	57:25
knew 14:24 81:22	37:2 75:18 84:16	legislature 79:5	LiveStreaming	lost 23:17 28:16
know 3:7,10,16,23	larger 22:18 27:5	Leopold 53:5	6:2,9	28:19 51:18 52:9
4:9,23 5:20 10:4	largest 9:8 64:7	Lessee 11:24	living 67:20,21	52:17 53:24
18:11 23:21	laryngitis 81:2	Lessees 6:17	lobbying 72:3	68:23
27:22 28:4 29:12	lately 83:4	lessons 33:24	locally 84:10	lot 6:19 12:1 26:7
29:13 30:6,25	Latino 70:10	41:14 51:4	located 5:18 51:8	28:3 29:23 38:7
32:24 34:4 35:1	launch 10:2	let's 10:10 15:13	52:2	42:7,10 45:20
36:8,12,19,20,21	launch-off 33:10	level 21:7 25:5,14	location 26:1 32:2	52:6,16 55:21,24
36:22 37:4,7	law 11:21 18:20	25:14 26:6,9	37:24 38:4	56:7 62:20 69:18
39:12,13,20	25:2 68:3 73:20	27:6 33:16 34:25	locations 22:18	72:16 74:19
40:11 42:2,20	76:10	79:11,18 85:1	30:14,15 39:11	75:13 82:15,20
43:16 44:6 45:6	lawyer 85:16	lies 65:15	62:14	82:21 84:25
46:16 47:7,15	lay 23:15 27:25	life 49:13 60:21	long 23:8 36:18	lots 65:1 77:2
49:3 54:14,16,20	28:2	66:9	57:12 70:14	83:20,20
56:7,14 57:11,19	lead 3:19 63:20	Light 46:25 79:23	74:24	love 49:12 73:5
61:19 62:15,18	leads 12:18	limit 17:1,13 47:7	long-term 66:1	loved 83:21
66:14 67:2,6,7	leak 9:17 38:25	limitations 21:13	longer 78:6	low 38:6
68:20 71:6 72:2	39:3 40:7,7,16	62:25	look 4:14 12:24	low-bleed 36:6
72:19 73:23 76:8	40:20,23 41:1	limited 8:15	37:10 45:12 47:6	low-hanging
76:21 77:3 82:16	61:17 62:22	limiting 15:7 28:6	47:18 55:17 56:2	73:25
82:19 84:2,14,20	leaked 47:21	limits 16:20,20,23	58:2,7 60:3,14	lower 18:15 48:23
knowledge 7:18	leaks 7:16 39:2,17	18:16	67:15 71:5 77:9	48:24
known 2:16	39:25 45:11	Linda 2:10 5:15	77:10,14 79:16	lowering 16:23

Lybrook 61:24	71:17,17	method 24:4	modeling 45:17,19	60:7,9 64:2
63:3	mean 24:5 27:17	method 24.4 methylene 48:16	modest 77:12	73:22,23 84:15
	27:18 33:19 34:7	48:19	money 49:7 53:17	nature 80:15,20
M	34:21 39:12,17	metric 47:22	60:19	nearby 35:19
ma'am 24:9 29:18	40:5 46:2 56:16	Mexican 53:3	monitoring 39:3	nearly 64:6
32:21 50:14	56:17	Mexican 55.5 Mexicans 59:4	76:23	necessarily 14:5
59:14 71:16	means 27:2 50:3	85:17	month 39:12	20:24 21:3 34:24
80:25	68:21 70:21 71:9	Mexico 1:13,22	59:11	62:22
Mack 15:11 32:9	82:21	2:7,19 5:22	monthly 17:14	necessary 16:4
34:17	meet 2:5	21:24 22:5 24:11	months 2:12	18:13
mag 7:14	meet 2:3 meeting 3:14,25	28:1 46:24 51:3	36:21	need 13:14 18:4
magnitude 13:4	4:2 29:22 55:16	53:8 54:3,16,17	monument 52:7	18:10 30:13
majesty 51:22	55:16 57:12		moral 80:13	
major 9:12,19	76:25 85:5	58:14,16 59:6 66:9 67:2,8,18		31:20 36:8,9 38:1 44:11 63:4
10:4 12:19 38:11			morning 6:8	
38:25 72:17	meetings 3:21 51:2 81:25	73:1,2 76:4,21	motivated 49:6,11	71:8 72:8 73:7 74:21 76:24
majority 37:2		78:4,5,15,20	MOU's 34:1	
76:12	member 57:9	79:22 85:13 87:1	move 8:3 11:2	79:10,11,12 80:8
making 21:6	64:25	87:11,13,18	16:7 25:19 44:10	80:10
45:14 60:19 64:7	members 29:23	mic 80:1	54:3 62:12 70:17	needs 12:9 14:5
70:17	51:21	microphone 82:19	80:8 81:15	71:8
man 80:2	membership 53:6	microphones	moving 8:16 17:7	negates 67:14
	memory 83:2	11:14,17	22:22 35:16 48:4	neighbor 85:11
manage 4:19 74:24	mention 6:11 7:12	middle 3:7	54:19 77:1	neighborhood
	55:5 65:1 68:17	midstream 19:2	much-needed	60:12
management 1:8 2:6 11:25 19:9	mentioned 6:6	56:21 57:4	63:24	nest 12:22
2:6 11:25 19:9 25:11	14:14 15:6 17:22	migration 52:14	mule 53:12,12	never 65:23 66:17
	33:21 41:2 42:2	Mike 61:13	multiple 55:25	78:16 80:20
managing 42:22	44:24 51:1 55:5	Milky 51:22	N	new 1:13,22 2:7
Mancos 64:19	62:24 65:8 68:16	million 16:13		2:18 5:22 7:2,5
mandate 54:22	71:1	47:22 53:8,15,19	name 2:5 5:17	12:13 14:2 18:1
manner 6:5	mentioning 84:12	mindful 56:15	11:14,20 21:22	21:18,24 22:5
March 7:12	Mercy 59:16	mineral 57:11	22:3 46:23 50:15	24:10 28:1,22,22
market 19:7,14,21	metal 66:23	minimize 4:17	53:1 54:7 57:7	28:23 30:6,14
66:24	meter 40:4	minimizes 22:24	58:12 61:13	31:19 36:3,6,14
marketers 38:5	methane 4:23	minimizing 7:8	63:13 83:24	36:15,24 37:18
Marlene 59:16	12:21 19:5 26:2	26:12	named 51:15,16	46:6,24 51:2
Massey 76:9	26:17 33:2,6	mining 78:24	nation 53:4 64:8	53:2,7 54:3,16
master 25:15,17	35:2 44:22 47:13	minutes 4:6 6:12	national 50:17,25	54:17 58:13,15
match 15:19	47:23 59:22 60:3	missing 7:23	51:4,7 52:1,7,9	59:3,5 63:9 66:9
matter 26:25	61:7 63:17,19,25	mistreated 80:20	60:3 76:1,5	67:1,8,18 73:1,2
Max 54:7 71:1	64:6,7,10,13	mitigate 59:25	78:11 79:10 85:1	76:3,20 78:4,5
maximize 26:1	65:3 72:20 75:3	61:6	natural 4:20 7:15	78:14,20 79:22
McCALLAN 81:1	75:23 76:3,5,8	mitigation 53:18	20:4 22:10 35:18	85:12,17 87:1,11
81:1	76:14,17,24 77:5	mix 15:16	35:23 36:18 38:1	87:13,18
McMAHAN	81:11	model 83:6	38:5,15 51:12	newly-developed

				1490 70
70:22	objectives 34:7	okay 16:7 17:7	27:12	15:25 18:11
NGO 24:22	69:16	20:2 22:2 24:25	options 16:17 21:8	32:18 34:7 43:9
NGO's 2:24	obligation 10:19	28:14 30:1 38:25	23:5 25:24 28:21	43:19,20 64:19
night 51:13,18,21	12:15 13:2	40:22 41:2 44:25	36:2 39:8	69:6,7,19 83:19
51:22 52:8,16,22	observation 82:25	45:6 46:19	order 31:21 65:20	84:15
nitrogen 57:1	83:13	Oklahoma 2:8	66:3	participate 24:22
NMOU 43:10	obviously 22:16	old 4:14	Orders 6:1	59:10
nongame 54:1	30:2,9,24 32:1	oldest 53:3	organic 29:1	participation 5:13
nonmethane	36:20 39:20 45:2	once 14:18	organization	particular 12:21
48:12	56:15 58:20 59:5	one-on-one 83:7	50:16 58:14	25:23 26:8 62:10
nonprofit 2:24	82:7	ones 34:6 75:23	71:19	62:13 77:23
nonroyalty-bea	occasions 56:24	ongoing 48:14	organizations	particularly 59:4
13:25	78:18	onshore 6:1,18	53:4 83:11	parties 8:5
normalize 34:3	occur 81:22 86:2	8:14,22	other's 74:12	Partnership 59:17
Norman 81:1	occurred 21:17	onshores 34:10	outdated 60:6	parts 18:8 25:17
North 4:1 51:3,25	October 2:12	open 25:24 44:7	Outdoors 54:9	party 22:12 27:24
52:4 57:10 58:5	off-ramp 30:20	44:14 46:3 70:15	70:1	28:7
northern 73:2	offered 80:14	79:13 83:3,6,15	outreach 1:9 3:20	path 48:7
note 8:14 20:14	offgasing 47:7	opening 17:10,22	3:25 6:2,4 8:2	path 48.7 pay 5:1 36:18,19
73:15 75:25	office 5:19,23 6:21	32:3	61:16	37:12 64:14
notes 87:9	6:22 12:2 20:21	opens 31:19	overall 63:19	67:23
notice 6:17 11:24	20:21 22:10	_	overdue 81:5	Payne 50:15,16,23
79:24		operate 35:18		
	24:21 53:15 60:5 63:2	operates 40:25	overlap 7:10 36:3	payoff 21:2
notion 76:22		operation 17:10	oversee 54:12	peer 45:3
NSPS 7:3 10:24	officer 28:20	operational 40:21	overturned 79:4	peer-reviewed
36:10	offices 12:12,15	40:23	overwhelming	45:3,13 48:2
NTL-4A 6:17,24	offloading 45:11	operations 8:22	30:15	pen 3:22
20:21 63:7	oftentimes 85:19	17:21 18:16 39:2	owned 13:18	penalize 77:25
number 6:13 7:22	oh 76:11 80:24	60:11 64:9	owner 57:11	Penny 16:3
21:13 23:9 27:12	oil 3:3 7:15 8:22	operator 16:25	P	people 13:19,20
28:6 31:1,22	13:17,17 16:8,23	17:17,20 21:9	P.M 1:12	15:17 46:15
33:12 39:11	20:4,12 22:24	38:2,10 55:23,24	packing 39:20	50:24 51:9,23
48:12 73:3	23:21 26:12	68:20 77:23		52:13 59:1 66:12
numbered 87:7	47:21 48:7 50:8	operator's 23:5	page 11:13 55:12	67:2,14 70:23
numbers 35:1	54:15,21 55:11	68:18	pages 7:17 87:7	71:21 75:12,13
NW 1:21	55:12,19 60:10	operators 20:9	Panel 47:24	75:14 78:22
0	63:22 64:5,9	22:7,8,15 27:23	paper 3:22 55:25	79:25 81:24 82:3
	66:24 67:7 70:18	30:5,10 31:15	papers 7:14,16	83:16,21,25 84:7
O 10:25 30:3,6,12	71:23 72:4,6,9	37:25 38:7 57:4	44:22 45:15	85:12
30:18,20 38:18	72:14 73:6,17	77:15,24 81:14	parched 81:8	people's 48:8
38:20 42:6,6	74:7,14,17,23	opportunity 2:4	park 50:16,18,25	percent 4:15 8:22
56:2 74:10 76:23	76:14 78:9 79:2	30:20 53:23 59:9	51:8,12,16 52:1	8:24 15:23,24
Obama 63:16	79:8 80:5 81:5	61:8 63:23 74:5	52:2,9,19	35:2 39:16 48:19
object 51:4	oilfield 66:10,16	optimize 26:11	parks 51:3,4	57:22 60:9,13
objective 8:1	67:17 84:3	option 23:20	part 6:12 9:23	64:6

				rage 99
perfect 53:18	35:11 56:21	73:22 74:16	practices 6:20	process 5:24 8:4,7
performance 7:3	pipelines 22:12	84:19	8:10	10:11 12:22,23
17:1,2	56:24 84:15	pointed 24:14	preamble 42:6	13:9 15:25 16:1
period 6:3,21 9:25	pipes 27:25	policies 60:6 62:1	preference 35:9	24:1 32:19 44:1
21:12,14 23:4,8	pit 78:22	policy 2:10 4:13	prenatal 48:23	45:4 48:15 69:14
23:17,23,24 24:1	pits 79:13	10:5,18,21 12:3	present 82:2	70:20
59:11	place 7:3 10:22	12:8,9 13:3	presentation 4:6	processes 37:5
periodic 39:9	18:24 19:11,17	17:12 20:9 22:25	presented 60:24	58:23 59:3 70:25
permanent 10:14	23:13 24:2 49:12	28:17 30:8 35:24	preservation	71:10 74:11
permission 15:15	50:8 54:12 85:8	61:5,9,25 63:5,6	49:14	processing 19:13
permits 32:14	place-based 12:17	pollution 64:9	preserve 49:13,20	19:19,20 36:5,6
Perrotte 59:15,16	places 63:24 70:9	70:13 79:12	52:22 63:25	64:5 68:15 69:5
Perry 73:16	70:12	poor 60:5	president 52:4,6	processors 19:3
person 71:18	Placitas 87:13	Pope 80:13	63:16	produce 54:22
personal 85:23	plan 20:13 22:23	portion 53:17,24	president's 75:22	produced 4:15,20
personnel 28:9	22:25 23:14 25:4	position 80:13	pressure 17:11	10:19 20:4
perspective 43:2	25:13,16,16,17	positive 75:25	40:15,24	producers 28:3
68:24 84:12	33:1 54:19 63:18	possibilities 61:1	pressures 16:11	67:7,22 84:8
perspectives 82:13	planet 60:21 84:7	possible 33:24	pressurized 35:18	producing 67:22
83:9	planned 8:7	44:8,14 46:3	presume 65:2	production 9:14
pertains 22:6	planning 12:23	56:12,17,19,19	pretty 5:3 37:13	10:12,17 16:8,11
27:22	13:9 18:22 19:9	70:20	79:9 85:5,7	16:18,19,24 17:5
pertinent 80:14	19:16 25:11	possibly 16:21	prevent 12:16	19:1,4,10 20:6
petroleum 21:24	26:24 68:5	18:14 23:9	13:2,8	20:11 45:21
22:5 27:11 29:20	plans 9:16 11:25	post-permanent	previous 32:24	57:23 64:5 68:10
37:22 47:6 50:4	22:22 23:15	10:16	price 36:17 38:1,5	68:10 81:6
54:11 66:18 70:3	26:24 70:17	potency 76:17	38:15,15	productive 58:19
70:4 73:23 83:10	plant 36:5,6	potent 64:2,3	principally 64:1	58:20
Ph.D 77:12	plants 48:1 76:15	potent 0 1.2,3 potential 10:6,22	principles 69:15	products 48:17
phase 10:21 25:25	plastic 66:21	16:17 17:16,18	prior 25:10 56:18	66:19,25 70:3,4
26:1 48:13	play 38:20	18:1 20:23 21:8	priority 33:12	73:23
phasing 26:16	please 27:9 61:15	23:5,20 27:12	62:8,12	profit 60:20 81:13
pick 31:1	pneumatic 8:24	28:21 36:2 39:8	private 77:3	program 3:3 5:21
picking 2:14	9:17 35:16,20,25	68:16	probably 17:3	programs 2:10
pie 8:12 14:14,17	37:24,24 38:19	potentially 16:23	38:6 43:24 58:2	39:1
15:8	pneumatics 36:6	21:4,18 28:25	66:20 69:17 72:4	progress 45:6
piece 36:14,15,16	45:11	29:4 36:11	problem 32:13	progressive 58:14
43:14 76:13	poet 49:4	power 25:22 35:19	problem 32.13	58:21
pieces 55:24	point 5:6 6:14	35:25 46:24	38:8	ProgressNow
pile 33:23 38:21	10:7,13 11:9	47:25 49:7 76:15	problems 4:9 28:3	58:13
piled 15:18	12:18 18:3,10	79:22	44:9 67:15	promulgate 34:8
pillage 49:8	23:11 25:11 26:3	powered 35:23	proceeding 1:17	promulgate 34.8 property 49:7
pilot 62:18	27:18 30:25	PowerPoint 55:8	76:2	proposed 44:1
pipe 28:2	31:14 33:10	PowerPoints PowerPoints	proceedings 2:1	46:8 62:8
pipe 28:2 pipeline 27:15,24	36:23 61:22	55:14	87:7,11	proposing 42:12
pipeiiie 27.13,24	30.43 01.44	JJ.1 4	01.1,11	proposing 42.12
	ı	<u> </u>	1	ı

42:16	56:2 74:10 76:23	rapid 63:22	recognized 51:12	78:24
protect 26:18	quality 42:22 43:6	rapidly 37:13	63:17	regulatory 8:4 9:4
54:24 63:25	43:16,18 45:10	rare 24:20 85:16	recognizing 10:24	24:12 33:22
70:23	48:10 56:5 63:25	rarely 20:7 79:24	37:18 69:11	38:13 41:8 55:22
protected 50:24	64:1 65:25	81:24	recommending	55:23 77:21
51:9	quantifying 40:1	rate 36:9	6:23	78:16
protecting 70:21	62:22	rates 21:1,2 37:6	record 17:21	reinjected 20:5
74:13,14	quantity 57:1	reach 56:20 82:9	recovery 22:11	reject 65:23
protection 63:24	question 11:15,16	read 45:1 64:20	28:20 38:2	related 68:12
protects 52:2	22:6 25:3 26:7	80:12	redefine 23:17	relationship 38:4
provided 21:15	27:17 29:24	readily 15:4	reduce 4:23 26:17	relatives 57:16
47:23	31:18 32:3,7	ready 62:5 69:2	36:14,24 38:21	released 4:25 7:20
provides 4:25	40:13 41:23,23	real 53:23 55:5	39:1 64:13 81:13	28:18 44:22
24:13	42:14,17 44:17	74:4	reduced 45:21	59:19 71:4
providing 16:20	68:5 73:10 80:23	realistic 9:23	87:9	relied 45:16
provision 38:19	83:19	realize 47:5 71:24	reducing 64:10	relief 40:15,24
public 1:9 13:18	questions 5:6,9	72:8 80:4	reduction 26:2	relies 20:16
14:6 26:20 50:9	6:13 7:22 10:8	realized 81:11	37:2	relieve 3:10
50:10,10 53:15	11:9 15:9 17:5	really 3:22 5:13	reductions 44:23	rely 45:20 73:22
54:18 55:11,15	18:17 20:1 21:21	14:24 15:15	60:12	relying 27:23
56:6 57:9 59:6	22:21 24:7 27:8	25:22 31:20 32:4	reevaluated 21:19	45:24
60:4,21 61:16	29:16,23 34:13	38:9 40:13,13,17	reference 11:23	remains 40:5
63:25 74:15,19	34:13 35:15	41:24 42:18,21	13:3	remedied 79:4
74:21 75:2,17	37:20 38:23 40:9	43:2,3 44:13	refine 9:4 68:23	remember 15:21
83:1,16	68:8 69:4 72:12	45:22 46:14 47:9	reflect 21:16	63:16 74:17
pumping 72:14	73:12	52:5 53:9 56:11	65:21,24 70:14	83:25
purging 9:14 17:9	queue 14:9	59:24 61:2,2	reflecting 65:18	renewable 72:6,24
18:16	queued 29:24	65:10 74:16,21	regarding 78:4	73:4
purposes 20:6	quick 25:3 55:5	76:24 81:3 82:8	regardless 14:7	renewals 21:13
push 6:23 17:12	quickly 5:13 32:14	82:17 83:19	region 55:20	repair 9:17 39:1
17:12	63:4	85:17 86:1,3	regulate 10:7	39:17 61:17
put 3:22 7:20 8:2	quite 24:21 78:20	realm 10:15 43:3	54:13,24 78:1,17	
10:25 11:12 18:8	quote 35:1 73:16	reason 5:1	78:21	replace 36:20
18:8,11,13,23	73:18	reasons 40:17	regulated 15:13	72:10
19:11,17 24:21		recapping 7:18	15:14	replaced 36:21
26:7 34:3 36:13	R	recapture 71:2	regulating 15:17	replacement 36:4
40:5 43:25 53:24	R/P 25:12	receive 20:10	43:5 77:5	36:24 37:18
66:11 69:5 72:23	R/P's 12:25	reciprocal 46:19	regulation 11:3	replacing 38:16
putting 10:16	raise 75:11	46:21	34:3 47:16 69:16	report 4:14 30:22
25:13,16 47:16	ramped 25:7	reciprocating	76:20 77:9,15,19	39:16 59:20,24
	ranch 52:2	45:22 46:22	78:4,11 79:7,10	60:24 64:18
Q	range 7:16 37:6	recognition 13:1	79:14,16,17	reported 1:17
Quad 10:25 30:3	82:2,17	29:3	regulations 10:25	48:17 87:6,11
30:6,12,18,20	Rangers 50:17	recognize 7:2 8:8	15:18 24:19 34:2	reporter 11:12
38:18,20 42:6,6	52:19	33:8	50:1 61:4 78:21	87:12

reporting 1:20	80:16	room 47:10 78:22	Saturday 82:1	separate 43:14
30:4 31:3 56:12	respectfully 80:1	Roosevelt 52:1,3,8	save 42:9 70:23	series 24:23
reports 7:19	response 30:25	routine 39:5	saves 44:5	serve 14:10
represent 47:1	69:7	royalties 13:20	saying 19:25 24:6	served 29:10
50:16 58:15,20	responsibility	14:2 15:23 53:16	31:9 32:11 44:10	66:24
74:6	61:19	59:5	46:9 55:22 76:3	service 50:18,25
represented 80:1	responsible 65:12	royalty 7:8 10:19	80:9 83:21	80:17
representing 22:7	restoration 53:18	16:16 28:19 35:7	scale 25:19 84:5	services 59:7
85:24,25	restricting 23:9	42:20 43:13	scheduling 39:5	session 2:3 7:13
reproduction	restrictions 72:3	royalty-bearing	Schlenker-Goo	55:6
52:14	restrictive 26:25	13:13,24 14:7	11:19,20 18:19	sessions 6:7 8:6
request 65:18	result 61:17 82:9	23:19 36:1	18:20 25:1,2,9	55:13,15
require 16:25	82:11	royalty-free 23:3	73:14,15,19	set 2:22 3:2,11 4:7
28:23 29:5	retired 50:17	23:11	school 66:15 67:9	7:18 34:5 38:5
	77:12			
requirement 30:4		RPR 1:19 87:5,17	scope 33:8 65:7,9 68:5	62:7 71:12
30:19 83:15	retirement 50:20	rule 12:13 13:8		settlement 61:18
requirements	return 21:1	33:5,7 41:3,9,10	scores 48:24	seven 49:14 84:7
10:23,24 30:18	revenue 4:18	42:6 44:1 46:8	scratch 41:14	Shale/Gallup
42:20,23 56:13	15:22 16:1 53:20	62:8,9 63:9	screen 55:7	64:20
requires 20:9	53:24	78:22	second 3:25 6:6	share 68:7
28:20	review 42:5 45:4	rulemaking 3:19	12:18 42:14	shared 49:17
requiring 17:19	60:23	12:4 14:22 23:25	62:13 65:17	shifting 21:4
36:4 63:7	reviews 6:23	62:1 63:23 74:11	sections 5:5	short 74:24
research 58:13	revised 21:15	rules 8:8,9,9 14:18	sediment 53:21	short-term 77:18
reservation 57:20	revision 54:19	28:23 34:5 36:10	see 14:17 27:6	show 10:1 48:18
57:24 58:5	rhetoric 85:19	56:5,5 64:8	32:12 36:23	showing 48:21
reservoir 16:10	rich 54:17	74:10 76:23	38:20 41:7 42:18	shows 47:21 50:7
17:11	right 3:10 6:25	82:11	42:21,21 51:18	sick 66:16
resolved 28:5	7:22 12:24 16:13	run 71:22 77:21	51:22 53:17,23	side 19:1,2 60:20
resort 17:19,23	17:7 22:22 27:21	running 38:13,13	57:13,15 60:17	70:7
resource 11:25	28:9 30:12 31:23	runoff 53:21	67:16 72:7,9,22	sides 43:23,23,24
13:21 22:11	35:16 39:2 41:5	rural 48:10,24	73:5 75:14	Sierra 24:11 26:4
25:14 26:12	45:4 57:22 69:22	53:9	seeing 63:3 84:6	63:14 64:17,25
43:16 51:12,13	75:19		seen 28:18 40:6	75:9,10
51:19 54:3 55:17	rights-of-way	S	52:11	sight 81:10
64:15 73:3 74:14	27:25 28:2	safety 14:6 32:1,1	sell 35:9 64:15	signed 43:10
74:23	Rio 24:11 32:22	32:4 40:17	Senator 2:16	significant 4:24
resources 4:19	64:25	safety-related	send 46:12,17	28:1 76:8
13:17,18,18	rise 61:7	29:11 31:18	senior 2:15 3:3	significantly 32:4
26:19 50:24	River 53:19	sake 33:4	5:17	64:8
51:10 52:13	Robert 63:13	Sally 60:25	sense 11:24 12:11	signing 23:3
74:18,18 81:9	rocks 72:16	sampling 48:11	12:20 25:18 35:4	similar 5:25 14:17
84:19	Rod 69:25	San 53:19 61:14	37:17	17:24
respect 59:21	role 42:18,21,25	SANDOVAL 87:2	sent 49:8,15 67:8	Simmons 55:18
79:11,12,13	roll 38:1	sat 40:10	sentiments 54:9	simply 74:23
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				P-J ,20
	-	-	-	-

				rage 102
Singer 68:2,2	sold 20:5	spelled 57:8	80:24	32:25 33:9 34:13
69:22	solicit 9:18	spelling 20:24	standpoint 83:8	41:24
single 15:17 25:20	solutions 3:24 4:9	spend 9:4	83:14 84:2 85:4	stove 74:4
25:21 37:23	84:23 85:6	spending 33:13	stands 70:8	strategies 52:15
38:12 64:7 67:9	solvent 48:16	spent 5:20	start 2:9 3:20 8:3	STREET 1:21
68:24 79:2	some-odd 6:19	spin 45:13	8:4 9:13 10:10	stricter 48:5
sinkholes 72:1	7:17	Spirituality 59:18	11:11 24:5 41:14	strong 60:3
sir 15:10 18:18	somebody 11:16	Spisak 3:2 5:15,17	70:7 85:8	strongest 55:2
32:8 41:17 57:6	62:15 80:24	8:19 14:11 15:2	started 14:21	strongly 25:10
58:11 61:12	soon 56:17 69:2	16:6 19:23 22:21	37:10 39:7 53:5	studies 31:20
63:12 68:1 73:13	sorry 8:20 29:19	24:25 25:6 26:22	84:10	43:11 45:16
Sister 59:16	81:1 82:23	27:17 28:11,13	starting 3:15 8:16	48:23 60:11
sisters 80:18	sort 7:8 11:23	31:5,8,13 32:6	46:5,7	study 42:9 45:13
sit 66:23	12:6 13:23 39:21	32:18 33:11	state 2:6,18,20	45:18,20 48:3,9
site 16:25 17:20	42:23 43:11	34:16,20,23 35:8	7:18 8:9 11:14	72:25 73:5
68:6,20	58:25 61:19,22	35:15 38:23	12:2,12,15 15:14	stuff 7:5 27:20
sites 64:18	68:9	40:20,24 41:5,12	20:17 34:5 47:3	32:11 45:11 56:7
sitting 66:19	sorts 35:17 52:15	41:17,20 43:8	50:5 56:8,11	69:19
situation 13:14	sounds 17:2 62:14	44:19,24 46:21	64:19 67:18 73:1	Subpart 30:3,6,12
32:17 82:11	source 7:2 8:13	50:13 52:25 54:6	73:1 74:11 78:20	30:18,20 38:18
situations 19:4	12:21 28:23 64:8	55:4 57:6,13	78:21,23 79:5,7	38:20
six 2:11 28:25	72:6	58:10 59:13	79:8,15,15,17,18	subscribers 58:15
30:18 67:10	sources 8:13 77:2	61:11 62:6 63:6	87:1	59:1,10
size 39:7	77:5,7	63:11 64:23 66:6	statement 9:5	subsidizing 13:21
skies 52:22	southeast 67:3	68:1 69:6,24	12:6 31:16	substantiate 13:23
sky 51:13,14,16	southern 73:2	71:15 73:9 75:7	states 4:11,11	success 74:9
51:18,22,23 52:8	Southwest 75:19	79:20 80:22	27:13 34:1 41:13	suggest 38:20
52:16	space 52:11 83:5	81:18 86:5	46:12,13 47:2	60:12,22
slant 46:25	speak 30:12 47:9	spite 66:12	51:17 52:23	suggesting 42:24
slide 4:6 6:12	59:1 62:16 82:13	spoke 59:21,22	55:25 64:7 69:8	81:6
61:15 65:1 68:12	speaker 32:25	77:11	85:18	suggestion 14:16
slides 68:17	speakers 65:19	sponsoring 57:8	Station 52:11	42:2
small 22:15 30:10	82:18	sportsmen 70:10	stay 78:5	supplement 72:8
55:23	speaking 32:25	spot 41:24	stayed 48:14	support 18:21
smaller 22:8 71:8	46:24 47:9 59:17	spots 72:13	stenographic 87:9	52:21
smart 2:14 76:4	specialist 55:24	staff 12:2 75:13	stepped 76:10	Supreme 76:12
Smith 14:9,12,12	species 54:2	stage 3:2,12,20,21	steps 81:12	sure 3:22 4:17
41:18,18,22	specific 16:9 20:25	19:4,10 25:12	sticker 49:18	15:2 16:14 21:6
social 75:3	21:1,12 25:4,6	stakeholder 24:22	stickers 49:6,11	31:7 34:11,16
society 74:25	26:5	stand 82:18	49:20	39:23 46:2 57:3
77:14,16 84:17	specifically 13:7	standard 21:6	stop 5:4 19:24	57:16 63:11
84:20	32:25	35:4 39:4	70:6	65:19 71:3 73:6
soil 47:19 49:23	specify 21:1	standards 7:3	storage 9:1,16	85:23
50:6	speech 3:9	50:2,12 60:4	28:15,17,18,24	surround 7:7
solar 72:5,10 73:4	speed 81:17	standing 66:19	29:6,12,16 30:2	sustainable 54:2
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				<u></u>
switch 15:20	temperature 61:7	thing 7:9 15:21	20:18 27:18 37:4	time-consuming
sympathy 73:21	temperatures	18:25 31:4,6,17	43:22 84:11	37:25
system 77:22 79:1	16:10 81:9	34:24 39:21	thoughtful 82:5	timeline 33:5,6
	templates 20:25	42:23 43:11	thoughtfully	times 17:14 42:3
T	tempted 78:18	62:11 74:2 78:11	82:14	48:20 56:1 64:3
tabs 55:12	ten 15:23 26:23	83:23	thoughts 7:21	timing 26:1 63:8
tail 30:11	tendency 83:4	things 7:23 9:6	11:7 37:17	today 2:4 3:2,13
take 4:6,9 6:11	tenets 20:20	29:14 32:15	threat 63:17	4:5 51:6,21 52:8
12:4 14:18 23:9	term 27:14 74:24	37:12 40:2,5,17	threats 78:8	73:16 80:11 81:4
33:24 39:19	74:24	42:7,11,25 43:2	three 11:22 12:5	81:12,22 82:7
49:10 53:24 56:7	terms 19:18 28:5	43:15 44:15 45:2	48:5 57:10 79:3	today's 59:23 85:4
58:2,7 63:9	30:18 41:7 55:22	47:6 52:6 54:17	83:5	Tohe 63:13,13
67:18 82:18	56:12 59:6 74:10	57:1 58:21,24	threshold 29:7,8,9	Tom 14:14 41:19
taken 12:24 81:13	76:16,23 79:6	60:2 62:24 68:16	31:18,22 37:9	68:2
takes 36:19	test 10:17 17:1	70:5 75:19	thresholds 29:11	ton 29:10
talk 10:4 50:23	21:3	think 3:17,18 4:8	39:12,15	tone 82:6 85:4
talked 8:6 68:22	tests 9:14 16:8,8	4:24 5:6,12 6:15	throughput 29:10	tons 29:1 30:18,21
69:1	16:11,14,16,18	7:13 10:12 12:5	39:6	47:22
talking 4:10,10	16:19,24 17:1,6	13:9 14:4 15:16	throwing 31:18	tools 25:15 39:22
7:10 17:8,25	20:24	19:8,15,17 24:15	thrown 37:15	54:12,24 55:1
27:16 28:6 37:8	Texas 2:7	26:5,22 30:25	39:13	top 37:8,15
42:7 43:20 45:10	thank 2:3 3:4,5	31:15 36:7 39:24	Thursday 6:10	topics 9:12,19
47:14 63:2 68:19	5:10 11:19 14:8	40:12 41:4,19	ties 22:9	12:19,20
74:1,17 84:4,13	15:1 16:5,6	42:7,9,16 43:6,8	tighten 39:19,20	Torrez 69:25,25
85:16	19:22 20:2 22:20	43:12 45:7,18	tighter 16:21	total 20:11
talks 49:5	24:24 26:21	46:9,13 47:17	tightly 29:14	totality 60:14,18
tank 28:17 29:17	28:12 30:1 32:20	49:14,20,25 50:3	Tim 3:2 4:5 5:4,14	totally 5:23
30:2 33:9 34:13	38:22,24 41:16	51:4 52:12 54:3	5:17 11:19 18:21	touch 43:19 46:13
tanks 8:25 9:17	43:7 50:13,19	58:6,18,19,22	22:6 25:3 44:17	52:17
28:15,18 30:6	52:24,25 54:5,6	59:22 60:2,14	time 3:8 5:8,11	town 67:16
41:24	55:3 57:8 58:10	65:8 66:13 70:5	6:21 9:6 12:4	toxic 48:16
tax 50:10	58:18 59:12,13	70:8 72:3,15	17:21 18:3,14	trade 79:1
taxes 67:24	61:8,10,11 63:10	73:24 74:5,9,16	21:12,14 23:18	traditional 70:11
teaching 76:10	64:22,23 66:5,6	75:18 76:22	23:18,23,24 24:1	transcript 1:7
team 67:12	67:25 71:15 73:8	78:13 80:14 81:4	24:4,17 27:14,14	11:12 87:8,10
technical 43:1	73:9,11,11 75:6	81:10 82:9,10,14	27:15,16,19,22	transcription
technological 6:19	75:7,12 79:19,20	83:18,25 84:17	32:14 33:14	87:10
technologies 44:9	80:22 81:18,21	85:4,15	34:12 40:6 42:10	transcripts 55:14
64:13 70:22,22	82:4 85:10,22	thinking 12:16	44:6,8 46:5 47:8	transportable
technology 16:22	86:1,4,5	19:1,16 25:12,20	47:19 48:19	8:11
40:3 42:22 56:22	thankful 59:9	25:22 68:4,7,8	57:12 62:7,10,23	TRATTEL 1:20
62:25 71:4	84:18	68:14 69:3 75:1	63:20 64:4 69:10	treatment 17:20
Teddy 52:1,2,8	thanks 5:14,15,16	third 13:11 22:12	72:2 81:22 82:5	tremendous 2:13
tell 42:10	28:13 32:6 82:21	27:24 28:7 62:2	83:15 85:22,23	57:25 60:6
telling 60:25	85:9,15	thought 6:3,15	85:23	trenches 50:19

				-
tribal 6:8 8:9 57:9	ultimate 13:9	16:21 17:18 21:2	45:23	warming 84:6
tribe 57:17	ultimately 3:19	23:11 27:1 35:17	vessel 33:9	Washington 5:19
tribes 57:10	26:11	36:13 41:9,14	vessels 9:1,16	5:23 55:16
tried 4:7	unavoidable	62:16 70:3,20	28:15,24 29:6,13	waste 4:17 7:8
Trina 71:17	13:12,24 42:19	71:2,5,7,13 72:9	29:17 34:14	12:3,8,9,16,21
trouble 53:11	unavoidably	84:19	VIDEOGRAPHY	13:2,3,4,6,8,12
true 45:22 70:2	23:17 28:19	useful 39:15 81:4	1:20	13:21,24 14:1
77:20 85:5 87:8	68:23	user 11:6	videos 55:15	26:2,18 43:13
trueing 34:2	underrepresented	users 70:11 84:8	view 66:3	56:15 60:3,6
Trujillo 54:7,7	47:10	usually 77:9,14,18	viewpoint 58:21	70:23 75:3
truly 60:16	understand 19:24	78:3,9	views 9:18	wasted 4:16 60:10
trust 50:10 74:19	31:25 34:23 45:8	utilizing 25:15	virtues 49:18	wasting 26:7
74:21 75:2	54:10,21 72:20		visibility 65:25	water 26:19 47:19
try 6:24 34:3	76:4 83:7,9 84:1	V	vision 80:2	49:23 50:6 54:25
56:16 72:10	Understanding	vacuum 7:1 33:19	visualize 34:18	56:23 70:13
82:10	28:21	vague 27:14	VOC's 29:1,11	72:14 81:9
trying 8:1 30:5,10	understood 28:11	validate 17:2	47:14 48:21	way 4:22 6:16
30:11,14 31:24	32:18 72:17	valuable 52:13	voice 47:10 70:19	7:24 11:17,18
33:21 41:13	undo 75:25	78:9	volatile 29:1	31:10,11 51:22
42:10 44:13 45:1	undone 78:23,25	value 31:10	volunteer 75:9	52:21 63:21
46:3 69:11,17,19	79:1	values 52:15	volunteers 75:11	69:12 77:19 82:9
69:21 74:1	uneven 20:20	valve 36:17 37:23		ways 71:5,9,13
turf 67:11,11	unfortunate 14:21	39:19 40:15,25	W	80:11
turn 39:19 78:13	UNIDENTIFIED	vapors 28:16,18	wait 76:22	we'll 4:1,2 5:8
78:18	8:17	28:24 34:19,22	waiting 61:25	7:10 9:13 16:7
turned 22:1	unique 19:8	35:6	want 2:2 5:12,24	62:12 63:9 72:8
twelve 15:23	unit 19:24	variances 24:13	8:8 9:7 10:13	we're 3:19 5:24
36:20	United 51:16	24:20,23 77:18	11:17 16:1 24:15	6:7,7,25 7:1,25
twelve-year 53:10	52:22 64:7	variety 11:25	29:12 33:23	8:1 9:3,12,18,24
twice 80:24	units 8:17	various 12:19	35:12 38:12 44:7	10:1,4,16 15:7
twist 49:3	unload 17:17	vein 65:11	44:10,15 46:3,7	17:8 20:19 22:10
two 8:25 11:23	unloading 7:14	VeneKlasen 53:1	49:2,13,20 50:5	28:5 29:25 30:11
12:4 37:9 40:5	9:15 17:8,10	53:2	50:23 55:21 57:8	32:2,14 33:1,12
43:14,24 51:3,4	UNM 66:11,15	vent 15:15	70:2,9,18 71:11	33:13,14,19,25
54:17	update 6:24	vented 4:16 10:20	73:21 75:16,25	41:12 43:24,25
tying 56:17	updated 14:15	20:6 47:22 56:25	80:12 82:4 84:3	44:13 46:5,7,13
type 9:8 27:4	updates 9:2	venting 3:15 6:4	85:12,15	49:21 50:11
43:21	upfront 18:22	6:18 13:15 16:12	wanted 3:11,20	51:19 52:21 53:3
types 29:14 35:23	19:16	17:18,19 22:24	6:3 18:21 24:4	53:10 54:1,13,14
37:4 40:1	uphold 50:12	23:1 34:9 35:13	29:24 58:1,17,24	54:17 56:15
typewritten 87:9	upstream 19:19	47:7 53:16 61:16	59:8 63:14 73:15	58:19,22 59:9
typically 17:8	urban 48:23	65:4,22 66:4	81:20 82:24	60:15 61:25
	urgency 75:16	73:17 75:3	83:23	62:11 63:3 67:21
U	usability 62:19	Verne 64:24 77:11	wanting 9:24	69:17,21 72:13
U.S 47:20 76:12	use 10:3,6 16:17	versus 13:25	wants 62:16 67:10	74:1,13,17 75:19
	<u> </u>			

				1490 103
75.00.76.05.05	44.00.45.15	66 15 65 22		21 07 10
75:20 76:25,25	44:22 45:15	66:15 67:23	1	31 87:18
78:6 79:14 81:8	59:19	worms 31:20	1,000 51:24	35 50:18 76:20
84:1,5,6,13,18	wider 82:2	worry 41:21	1,100-plus 57:21	4
84:24 85:2	WIESE 1:19 87:5	worse 41:20	1:00 1:12	
we've 3:16,22 4:10	87:17	worst 59:25	100 51:9 53:5	4 6:1
4:10 6:8 11:24	wildlife 26:15,19	worth 67:3 84:11	100,000 58:15	4,000 58:4
12:24 19:3 27:3	52:14 53:3	wouldn't 18:12	12:00 8:16	40 47:2 53:19
29:13 35:1 46:14	willing 52:21	24:5 29:2 35:19	12TH 1:21	57:21 60:9 64:6
55:5 62:9 67:1	82:18	44:10 66:20,21	14 51:17	4A 6:17 11:24
71:14 72:21 76:4	willingness 82:12	wrench 39:19	14th 41:4	
76:13 77:2,3	willy-nilly 16:3	wrong 66:13	15 4:6 6:11 36:25	5
78:21,23,25	wind 72:5,11 73:4	Wyoming 17:24	44:22	5 6:1
80:24 81:10	wonder 43:4 50:8	69:9		50 16:13 57:21
wealth 2:25 67:23	68:20 80:1,6		15th 6:10 30:4	
web 11:13 55:7	81:25	X	18 68:12	6
website 55:11	wondered 68:7	X 39:11 78:3	19 68:13	600 53:8
week 4:1,2 55:9	75:10		1996 45:20	609 1:21
57:14 83:5	wonderful 46:11	Y	2	
weekends 83:20		Y 78:3		7
	wondering 33:1	yeah 25:9 37:1	2,000 58:4	7 1:11
weeks 62:3,3	50:11 71:22	44:3 46:12 63:1	20 5:20	70 7:17
weight 28:9	word 46:20 79:21	67:20 81:20	20-something	73 48:19
welcome 2:2	words 81:19 85:12	year 7:20 12:4	79:25	76 66:10
well-by-well 21:4	work 2:5 3:15	23:2 29:1,11	20-year 64:4	
27:2,4	4:11 5:11 32:16	30:19,21 37:7	2009 72:25	8
well-level 68:10	41:9 44:11 45:6	48:11 51:11 53:5	2010 4:14 53:14	8.4 47:22
wellhead 10:14,16	46:6 52:20 55:25		60:5 61:17	80 60:12 64:3
36:5	56:10 59:8 68:25	53:8,20 81:8	2011 8:14 47:23	87102 1:22
wells 11:1,5 16:9	69:12,20 74:7	years 4:14 5:20	72:25	89 47:2
16:21 18:1 21:18	81:16 82:5,15	6:19 7:4 12:4,5	2013 5:25	
22:17,24 23:21	84:24 85:6	26:23,23 36:19	2014 1:11 60:24	9
25:5,6 28:22	workday 3:7	37:9 43:12 48:6	87:14,18	90 15:24
29:5 30:9,24	81:23	50:18 51:9,24	204 47:25 76:15	95 35:2
57:21,21 58:4	worked 5:3 6:3,15	53:5 66:10 67:10	22nd 87:13	97 39:16
68:6	69:15	72:22,22 76:20	23 53:15	
Wendell 49:4	working 2:16 3:12	78:9 79:3	24 16:14 17:13	
73:16	5:21,21 33:12,14	yesterday 4:25	25 8:21,23	
went 51:21 66:11	33:18,20 45:7,25	59:19	27th 60:24	
West 49:19 51:20	46:14 47:3 62:9	young 44:21		
84:15	62:11	younger 81:24	3	
western 11:21	workload 32:13	youthful 83:18	3 6:1	
18:20 25:2 48:10	workovers 8:23		30 4:13 6:18 7:17	
68:2 72:24 73:3	works 5:7,10	Z	16:12 36:19	
73:19	71:19	Z 78:3	301 87:18	
whatsoever 13:1		zero-bleed 36:7	30th 10:2 55:6	
	world 2:23,24		62:2	
white 7:13,16	51:17 53:17	0	02.2	
	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>